National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XXI. NO. 21. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1860. WHOLE NO. 1,061.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,
AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
At its Office, No. 5 Beekman Street, New York,
AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE
PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
107 *N. Fifth St., above Arch, Philadelphia.*

Letters for publication, or relating in any way to the editorial conduct of the paper, should be addressed, "EDITOR OF THE NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, NEW YORK."

Letters enclosing subscriptions, or relating in any way to the business affairs of the paper, should be addressed, "PUBLISHER OF THE NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, NEW YORK."

ADVERTISEMENTS, 10 cents per line each insertion.

Pro-Slavery.

In this Department we give place to such extracts from the Pro-Slavery Press, North and South, as serve best to illustrate the character of Slavery and the spirit of its champions and apologists.

COMING UP TO THE ISSUE.

From The New Orleans Picayune.

THE late nomination of John A. Andrew for Governor of Massachusetts by the Republicans of that State is an event of much significance. No man in the old Commonwealth is more thoroughly a radical Abolitionist, none more fierce in hostility to the institutions of the South, than he. Even the philippics of Sumner and the inane rant of Wilson in the United States Senate have not been more offensive to constitutional principles, or more destitute of courteous regard for the opinions of a large section of the Union, than the utterances of John A. Andrew.

The nomination of this man for the honorable position of Governor of Massachusetts is proof of the momentary predominance of pure and unalloyed abolitionism in the ranks of the Republican party of that State. As the Jacobin Clubs of Paris, in the times of the French revolution, triumphed over the Montagnards, the pure fanatics of the Garrison school have trodden down the conservatism found in the Republican ranks. Representing one idea, pressing forward without regard to consequences, courting even bloodshed, domestic insurrection and civil war, as the fruits of their agitation, if these be necessary or even the shortest road to the accomplishment of their objects, they have outgeneralled and defeated the irresolute and timid associates, who faintly desire the same end, but only through constitutional, peaceful and legal means.

The result is not contrary to the teachings of history. Pure radicalism has always overcome the forces of conservatism, while the latter was in any manner associated with the former. Radicalism is aggressive: any conservative elements connected with it rather aim to restrain advance than make defences against assault. Radicalism appeals to the passions and brute instincts of its followers; while the existence of its conservative ally is maintained by the predominance of sound judgment and unclouded reason. The former disregards all obstacles to success; the latter is always governed by some degree of loyalty to law. Against the aggression of the former, conservatism can therefore make no long continued, successful resistance, unless in the field of acknowledged and open warfare.

The alliance of conservatism with abolitionism in Massachusetts, and, it may be added, elsewhere, must be totally dissolved, or the latter will finally bring the whole party up to its own issues. To them, in the Bay State, every Republican who stands by the present nomination is committed. It is impossible to avoid the conclusion, attempt to parry it as they may, they acknowledge John Brown as a holy martyr to a great and noble idea: they sanction the scattering of firebrands among their fellow-citizens of the Southern States, and declare fierce and inextinguishable warfare against its social institutions. Will the party suffer no loss by the bold and treasonable position it has chosen?

The same process of coming up to the issue presented by unalloyed abolitionism is witnessed in other States. The radical doctrines of leaders, which, when first announced, startled the public, have by oft repetition come to be regarded as sound and incontrovertible, and now, bearing a less odious name, a gigantic party is enrolled under its black banner.

It is this tendency of the Republican party of the North, at last so unmistakably developed, that gives hope of a division of its strength. Its conservative elements cannot honestly coöperate with it. The line is past when reflecting, sagacious men—men who appreciate the blessings of the Union and understand the long train of woes its dissolution must create—can acknowledge any affinity with opinions so atrocious, doctrines so hostile to public peace, and measures so opposed to the dictates of honor and humanity.

A division in the Republican ranks is plainly anticipated in Massachusetts. The leading Republican journals already have faintly attempted a denial of the extreme radicalism of John A. Andrew. His language is explained as not fully indorsing the murderous foray of that arch-traitor, John Brown, into Virginia. It is thus admitted that a considerable body of the Republicans cannot be induced to take this advance step in the fanaticism that seems to have taken possession of the majority of the inhabitants of the State. Those who assembled in Union meetings in that State to denounce the Virginia raid, have an opportunity of showing their sincerity.

This attempt to force the masses by their leaders up to their new issues, while it betrays their ultimate designs, is the basis of a general movement all over the free States of resistance to further progress—the foundation of a party composed of men of all political creeds to sustain the union of the States by maintaining all the guaranties of the Constitution. As the danger of the people coming up to the extreme issues presented by wild and reckless factionists of the country increases, the more earnest the action and the greater the numbers of those who are ready to sacrifice something of personal predilection for the welfare of their country. It is witnessed in the approach to harmony in movement of distinct party organizations in several States, and in the growing strength of whichever branch of the opposition to the Republicans seems to have the largest body of followers.

Let no Southern man doubt the possibility of the success of the great conservative, constitutional movement to defeat the ambition of avowed sectionalism. The very audacity of its avowals, in the pride of its strength, and the determination to bring the whole of its party up to its ultimate issues, is likely to prove its overthrow.

PASSMORE WILLIAMSON.

From The Philadelphia Sunday Atlas.

THIS notorious individual has entered a libel suit against *The Sunday Atlas*, with the view, perhaps, of preventing us from showing up the intrigues of scoundrels who infest this community. If this is the object, then we can inform him that he will not attain it. We claim a charter free as the wind, to blow when, where, and on whom we please; and if Passmore Williamson behaves in a manner as becomes a good citizen, then he has no cause to fear at our hands. We never invade the sanctity of the domestic circle; we never array ourself against the law of the land; we never commit perjury by making false returns to a writ of *habeas corpus;* we never spirit away niggers nor become their guardians; we never received money from alleged fathers of little negro girls, and placed the little girls in the House of Refuge without consent of their fathers. No, we are entirely too far above such mean, contemptible, immoral action as this. The man who does such things as these cannot in justice and in truth expect any show of mercy at our hands. We have an idea that the Abolitionists are revilers of the divine, common, statute and moral law. They would raise the servant against the master, and stain our country with the blood of innocent men, women, and children. They would pillage our country, destroy our property, and put to the sword and the stake all who did not choose to agree with them that the negro is equal to the white race. We have a contempt for such men, and should like the opportunity of subscribing liberally to the purchase of Kentucky hemp enough to hang the whole fraternity of these agitators. If Passmore Williamson is one of these Abolitionists, then we are free to say that the fate of John Brown cannot be executed upon him too soon. Brown, who met with a deserved fate at Harper's Ferry, doubtless thought he was doing right. He had been goaded on to madness by the poor, sneaking, craven cowards, like the Motts, the Smiths, the Williamsons, and the Garrisons, none of whom would dare to effect that which, under the cover of law and distance, they advocate. No! their doctrines are dishonest and abominable, and we, as truly independent journalists, shall ever raise our voice and wield our pen in condemnation of them, whether our sanctum remain where it is now, or whether it shall be behind the grating of a prison cell.

MADNESS OF THE SLAVEHOLDERS.

Correspondence of The New York Herald.

ATLANTA, Ga., Sept. 23, 1860.

Returning from a brief but searching visit to the interior plantations, your correspondent has arrived at these conclusions:

1. That the Northern people labor under the grossest ignorance in regard to the relations of master and slave on the plantations.

2. That intense excitement exists in all the isolated districts in regard to the movements of the Abolitionists of the North.

3. That the agricultural population is rife for revolution and separation.

4. That if Lincoln be elected, men can be found ready to go to Washington, and by force prevent his inauguration. And,

5. That there already exists an armed league, pledged to this and other purposes, hostile to Lincoln's government.

Startling as some of these conclusions are, yet there are frequent grounds for believing them warranted by the facts.

NORTHERN PREJUDICES.

Many Northern people labor under the most absurd prejudices relative to life upon the Southern plantations. They hold up continually the terrible picture of slaves scourged, manacled, branded and burned. They figure to themselves the position of slaves in the cotton fields, working under the lash, and whipped for every slight neglect of duty. Nothing could be more ridiculous. Instead of the lash being the stimulant to labor, cupidity and the prospects of personal gain are the actual incentives. On many regulated cotton plantations the slave has an interest in the crop and in its expeditious gathering, and, however small his proportion may be, it is, nevertheless, a sufficient stimulus to the negro's cupidity to render the use of the whip altogether unnecessary. They work hard, faithfully and cheerily; and when the day's work is done they have their merry dancing and singing frolics, so full of original humor that they would create a pleasurable sensation in the heart of the stiffest Abolitionist the North can produce. The negroes are happy and contented in their work in the cotton fields. It is their normal condition, and those who gainsay the assertion had better go South and examine for themselves. The relation between master and slave is that of mutual interest. It is the interest of the master to feed, clothe and house his negroes well; and it is the negroes' interest to work faithfully and diligently in view of coming rewards.

INTENSE EXCITEMENT IN THE ISOLATED DISTRICTS.

Nothing is more clear than that the most intense excitement prevails in the isolated agricultural districts, arising from the reports of the diabolical operations of Abolitionists in other sections of the country, Texas particularly. The planters have no fear of the fidelity of their slaves, if kept aloof from the devilish machinations of Northern incendiaries; and even in such a case, they are thoroughly confident that out of every hundred slaves who may be tempted, not more than one will prove treacherous. In these isolated districts the planters and their sons have but little else to do than to ride, shoot and superintend their plantations. The boys in these districts are born on horses, and the girls soon learn to stimulate their brothers to gallant and intrepid deeds. The agricultural region in South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Texas, etc., can produce a mounted force of riflemen that cannot be surpassed in the field by any other class of people. And terrible as the reality may be, the state of public feeling is at this time such as to warrant the belief that this vast force of armed and mounted men will be concentrated both for assault and defence, upon the commission of the first overt hostile act by Lincoln, in case he should be elected. The young men in the agricultural districts are ready for a fight at any moment, and indications are everywhere to be seen that even the most conservative planters are ripe for revolution and separation the moment their rights are invaded by the federal power. This is no idle talk, but a photograph of the actual condition of things in the immense agricultural districts of the South.

WILL THE INAUGURATION OF LINCOLN BE FORCIBLY RESISTED?

Your correspondent has examined carefully into this subject, and has arrived at the conclusion above expressed. There is no disguising the fact, or hoodwinking the matter. The hate entertained by thousands of Southerners toward the Northern Abolitionists is intense and chronic. They consider them their deadly foes, conspirators who would incite servile insurrection, and applaud the bloodiest deeds of the insurgents. They regard Lincoln as the representative man of that class, and rather than be ruled by him, they would make forcible resistance to his inauguration. Fifty or one hundred exasperated Southerners—and I know they exist—might cause the streets of the capital to flow with blood, and one drop spilled will be the signal for a general rising in the South, and a demand for separation. You would be astonished to witness the feeling on this subject among some of the most intelligent people in the agricultural districts, where the strength of every State actually lies.

IS THERE A SOUTHERN LEAGUE?

Indeed there is, and a strong one, too. It has its agents in every county in this State. The league is composed mostly of planters, who are arranged into companies under the command of suitable captains. The patrol is out every night, all over the State, and are on the watch in every direction for negro stealers and incendiaries. A number of desperate white men have already been caught and hanged for burning dwellings and gin-houses, and enticing negroes to run away. Caves have been lately discovered where these negro stealers would rendezvous, huddle their negroes together, and concoct plans for future depredations. Apart from suppressing these gangs of villains, the object of the Southern League is to bring about a cordial coöperation among Southerners, and to be ready for action the moment the critical question of union or disunion is to be decided. That there are men in this League who would go to Washington and forcibly prevent Lincoln's inauguration, I am already apprised. Everything in the heart of the Southern country now gives the assurance that a political volcano is smothering, which is destined, some time or other, to burst and scatter desolation and devastation over this fair land. But will not the hand of the Almighty be interposed to prevent so dreadful a catastrophe?

ECCLESIASTICAL NOTICE OF SLAVERY.

From The World—the new Religious (!) Daily.

THE Episcopal Diocesan Convention refused, on Thursday, by a nearly unanimous vote, to receive resolutions introduced by Mr. JOHN JAY, respecting the slave trade. The resolutions were not readily seconded, and when Mr. JAY proceeded to discuss them, he was cut off by a motion to lay upon the table, which immediately prevailed—a discipline to which this gentleman manages to expose himself in connection with the same or kindred subjects, at almost every convention of the diocese.

The members of the Convention should not be accused of indifference upon the subject, because they prudently refused to risk, in their ecclesiastical capacity, a discussion which might endanger the paramount purposes of their meeting. There was probably not a gentleman present, who, in his private capacity, would not bear testimony against the wickedness of the slave trade, as earnestly as Mr. JAY himself. But in their diocesan capacity they had other interests to consider, and, for the sake of avoiding a hasty reproach, could not take the risk of discussion. There would not be the least occasion to notice this action of the Convention, except for the excitability of the public mind, and its unfortunate aptitute to judge those rashly who are so firm as not to be hastened from their duty by popular pressure. It is difficult to do right in such circumstances, and an instance of temperate firmness should, therefore, be the more distinctly noticed.

It will probably be thought by many persons who would not approve the introduction of this question into a religious convention under ordinary circumstances, that at such a time as the present, a proper deference to righteousness and justice requires a different course—at least as much as a distinct recognition of Christian duty in reference to the slave trade. The abomination, which we hoped was dead and buried, shows signs of life, and they would say that every Christian organ should protest against it. It is quite possible that the Convention might have acceded to a resolution, embodying such an expression of opinion, but these resolutions claimed so much that the Church would have been placed by their adoption in a questionable and aggressive attitude. The preamble asserted that "the city of New York hath become the greatest slave-trading mart in the world," and that it is so because of the "want of an enlightened and conscientious public opinion in reference to the great wickedness" of this traffic—both which propositions the Convention might properly refuse to indorse. The resolutions called for a pastoral letter on the subject, and recommended that the clergy should preach against it—a course which is clearly uncalled for, and which would only have the effect of diverting the minds of the members of that denomination from the cultivation of the Christian graces, which are the surest antidote against the prevalence of every sin and abuse, the African slave trade not excepted.

These remarks, we need hardly say, are not made with any favor to the piratical traffic. The estimation in which it is held in this community is that of almost unanimous detestation, and it is, therefore, not at a point to call for ecclesiastical interference. The civil authorities, who do not bear the sword in vain, have the matter in hand; if they neglect it, the people will take it up, and instruct them in a way not to be mistaken—in a way that need not interrupt the spiritual influences which church organizations are intended to promote, and which are so easily disturbed by impertinent intrusions.

A striking example of the mischief of ill-advised action in this respect, is at present prominent before the public, in the deplorable condition of the Church of the Puritans. This large and once influential Church has degenerated into a close corporation, whose proceedings seem to be marked by any other spirit than Christian charity and meekness. Every lover of religion must lament the occurrences which have been made public within the last few days, as well as those which occurred previously to Dr. Cheever's departure for Europe. If fiery fanaticism is better than peaceful religion—if "hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife," are better than "long-suffering, gentleness, goodness and faith"—such procedures are commendable; otherwise, not.

THE STANDARD.

POLITICAL ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

To the Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

THE adjourned meeting of the Political Anti-Slavery Convention, which met in Boston, May 29th, was held in Worcester, Massachusetts, September 19th and 20th, in Washburn Hall. The object of the Convention was to "consider the propriety of organizing a political party upon the basis of an anti-slavery interpretation of the United States Constitution, with the avowed purpose of abolishing slavery in the States as well as the Territories of the Union." The meeting was called to order at 10 o'clock by Mr. STEPHEN S. FOSTER, of Worcester; Wm. Coe, of Worcester, was chosen President *pro tem.*, and A. P. Brown, Secretary. Mr. Foster read the call for the Convention. Frederick Douglass, of Rochester, New York, addressed the Convention on the necessity of a return to the radical anti-slavery ideas for which the originators of the anti-slavery movement contended, and their advancement by political means. Mr. Foster reviewed the position of the American Anti-Slavery Society at some length. Mr. Douglass and E. T. Hutchins, of Killingly, Connecticut, followed in remarks on the principles to be adopted by the new party. Mr. Locke, of Athol, spoke in defence of the American Anti-Slavery Society.

At the commencement of the afternoon session Mr. Foster spoke, continuing his remarks begun in the forenoon. He offered the following resolutions as embodying the principles of the proposed new party:

RESOLUTIONS.

Resolved, That we, the friends of freedom, assembled in convention, in the city of Worcester, on the 20th day of September, 1860, do hereby organize ourselves into a political association, to be known as the Union Democratic Party of the United States of America, upon the following basis and platform of principles:

1. All men, irrespective of color, condition, sex, or nationality, have a natural and indefeasible right to themselves, and no government, association, or combination of men on earth can, by any possibility, give to one man any right of property in the person or labor of another, except by his own voluntary consent.

2. It is the right and duty of all men to defend their own liberty by the most potent means which God and nature have placed in their power, at whatever cost to their oppressors. "Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God," in black as well as white—in bond as well as free.

3. It is the imperative duty of our national government to protect, impartially, all the inhabitants of the country in the full enjoyment of all their natural rights; and any administration which, under any pretext whatever, seeks to evade this duty, is false to the fundamental principles of democracy, false to the Constitution, false to every principle of moral obligation which binds us together as a civil community, a dishonor to the country, and utterly unworthy of the confidence and support of any genuine friend of freedom.

4. The people of the United States, and not the Supreme Court, are the ultimate arbiter in all questions involving the interpretation of the Constitution. By our theory of government the people are the only rightful rulers of the country, the courts, as well as the legislature and the executive, being mere agents entrusted with authority to execute the popular will; and hence, it is their right and duty to review, and for sufficient reasons to reverse the decisions of their courts, and any court which should refuse to obey the clearly expressed will of a popular majority would be an intolerable despotism which should be at once demolished.

5. The United States Constitution, fairly interpreted, is entirely and unequivocally on the side of freedom. It prohibits the existence of slavery in the States, and invests the Federal Government with ample powers for its overthrow, wherever found, whether under Territorial or State legislation; and the friends of freedom ought everywhere to insist upon the immediate application of those powers to the removal of an evil which has already made our country a reproach to the cause of freedom throughout the civilized world.

6. As justice is impartial, and all men are by nature equal, all laws, to secure our respect and support, must be based upon general principles, operating equally upon all classes of society, securing to each an equal share in all the natural gifts of a common Creator.

7. Slavery is organized piracy, with many features of barbarism and infamy unknown to any system of piracy ever practised upon the high seas; and any administration, by whatever name it may be called, which sanctions or tolerates it, in any of the States or Territories of the Union, is not only guilty of all the crimes inherent in the slave system, but is also guilty of treason to the Constitution which it has sworn to support. Consequently we shall recognize no such administration as the legitimate government of the republic; we shall not act with it; nor shall we recognize any of its acts as having any legal or binding force other than that which traitors can give to the statutes which they enact; and as all the powers of the government are dependent upon the purse, we shall consent to no appropriations from the national treasury till it shall become in fact what its founders designed it should be, and what they made it in form, the impartial protector of all from whom it required allegiance or submission.

8. Any act which, if done by a private individual, would be a crime against natural justice, when done by an officer of government is equally criminal, and doubly dangerous. It is, therefore, the duty of all good citizens to resist, in all suitable ways, the execution of the infamous fugitive enactment of 1850, and all other legislation intended to subvert the rights of individuals, whether black or white, for the benefit of a favored few.

Finally: Recognizing in woman the same capacity for government which we find in man, and the same necessity for its protecting care, we invoke her aid and co-operation in this sublime moral effort to transform, by peaceful political means, a slaveholding despotism into a model of republican liberty, justice and equality.

Mr. Foster spoke at some length, in explanation and defence of these resolutions, taking the ground that the United States Constitution is eminently an anti-slavery instrument, which, if carried out in its letter and spirit, as it should be, would set at liberty every slave in the land.

Dr. Calvin Cutter, of Warren, thought it not so clear that the Constitution was anti-slavery; if it was so, there were some features in it which might possibly be construed otherwise. He thought it might be well to so amend the Constitution as to set the matter at rest beyond all doubt.

The chairman, Mr. Douglas and Mr. Foster thought the Constitution well enough, it being in letter and spirit thoroughly anti-slavery if strictly carried out. Mr. Douglass made an eloquent and telling speech in defence of the organizing of a political party on the basis of an anti-slavery interpretation of the Constitution.

In the evening, Dr. Daniel Mann, of Ohio, presiding, Mr. Foster introduced the following resolutions:

Resolved, That it is neither consistent nor possible for a people who depend upon government for the protection of their own liberty and rights, to abolish the institution of slavery and defend the liberty and rights of its victims, by moral power alone; and hence any scheme of emancipation which either ignores political action altogether, or depends upon pro-slavery political parties to do its work, is radically defective in principle, and must inevitably end in failure and bitter disappointment.

Resolved, That the great want of our country at the present time is a National Political Education Society, whose object shall be to educate the people, the rulers of the country, in a thorough knowledge of the fundamental principles of democratic government, and of their duty to defend and enforce those principles, in every part of the Union, for the impartial protection of all inhabitants, irrespective of color, condition, sex or nationality.

Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed by this Convention to correspond with prominent friends of freedom in different sections of the country upon this subject, with power to call a Convention for the purpose of organizing such an association at such time and place as they may deem expedient.

Resolved, That in this sublime moral effort to arrest the downward tendency of our government and transform a slaveholding despotism into a model of justice, simplicity and equality, by the only means which afford any rational hope of success—viz., the education of the people in the science of government—we invoke the aid of all classes of our fellow-citizens, but especially do we solicit the co-operation of those manufacturers of public sentiment, the clergy and the conductors of our periodical press, without whose ultimate sanction and aid no work of national reform can ever succeed.

Lucy Stone defended the American Anti-Slavery Society. She thought the United States Constitution to be not an anti-slavery document, and, before acting under it, it should be so amended that it could not be construed in favor of slavery. Mr. Foster spoke in answer to her. Adjourned.

September 20. Met at 10 o'clock. The Committee on Nominations reported the names of Dr. Daniel Mann, of Ohio, for President, and W. A. Wilson for Secretary. Adopted.

Lucy Stone, A. P. Brown and Calvin Cutter were added to the Business Committee.

Dr. Mann spoke in favor of the new party movement.

T. W. Higginson, of Worcester, was opposed to the whole movement, believing it to be uncalled for and impracticable. Messrs. Douglass and Foster spoke in answer to Mr. H.

In the afternoon, after the reading of the various resolutions before the Convention, E. D. Draper, of Hopedale, made a speech opposed to Mr. Foster's position, and in defence of the American Anti-Slavery Society. He believed Mr. Foster's non-resistant theory to be inconsistent with his practice.

Joseph A. Howland spoke in defence of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and against an anti-slavery construction of the United States Constitution.

Mr. Foster defended his position as a non-resistant. Mr. Douglass addressed the Convention on the principles and policy of a republican government.

In the evening, on motion of Mr. Foster, the resolutions in relation to an Anti-Slavery Educational Society were adopted. Mr. Foster moved the adoption of the platform, and the formation of an Executive Committee to make nominations, and call another Convention, if they shall see fit. Mr. Douglass spoke in favor of the motion. Mr. Howland criticized his remarks. Mr. Foster advocated his motion, and it was adopted unanimously. The chairman of the Nominating Committee reported:

For the Anti-Slavery Educational Committee: S. S. Foster, J. H. Stephenson, A. P. Brown, Frederick Douglass, and J. H. Fowler.

For the Executive Committee: S. S. Foster and A. P. Brown of Worcester, J. H. Stephenson of Boston, Frederick Douglass of Rochester, N. Y., J. H. Fowler of Cambridge, Ernestine L. Rose of New York, Elizabeth C. Stanton, and John Pierpont.

The nominees were unanimously elected.

On motion of Mr. Douglass the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the members of this Convention, called to consider the proposition to form a sound Abolition political party, extend their earnest sympathy and their hearty God-speed to the little band of faithful Abolitionists which has nominated GERRIT SMITH as their candidate to be supported for the Presidency in the coming election.

After further remarks by Mr. Douglass and Mr. Foster the Convention adjourned, subject to the call of the Executive Committee.

Letters were received from Henry T. Cheever, of Jewett City, Conn.; Homer B. Sprague, of New Haven, Conn.; Elnathan Davis of Fitchburg, and many others, indorsing the movement, and from Charles Sumner and others against the movement.

DANIEL MANN, President.

Wm. A. Wilson, Secretary.

The Episcopalians and the Slave Trade.

SPEECH OF JOHN JAY, ESQ.,

In the Diocesan Convention of New York.

IN the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of New York, sitting in St. John's Chapel in this city, on Thursday, Sept. 27, 1860, JOHN JAY, Esq. (the worthy grandson of the noble JOHN JAY of the Revolution), offered the following resolutions:

Whereas, This Convention are advised by numerous and convincing proofs that the traffic in African slaves, which the people of the United States intended should forever cease after the year 1808, hath been re-established in the city of New York, the seat of our Episcopate, within the limits and jurisdiction of this diocese, in violation of the laws of God and the statutes of the republic. And whereas, it further appears that the said traffic hath during the last year increased so rapidly from this port, that the city of New York hath become, in the language of the London *Times*, "the greatest slave-trading mart in the world." And whereas, it would appear that the said trade so flourishes, and the laws of the republic are thus trampled on, for the want of an enlightened and conscientious public opinion in this community with reference to the great wickedness of the said trade. And whereas, also, it belongeth to this Church to endeavor so to act that all error, ignorance, pride and prejudice may be dissipated, and that truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us. Therefore, resolved,

1. That this Convention respectfully ask the Right Reverend Bishop of the diocese to address a pastoral letter to the people of this diocese, in reference to the African slave-trade, as now prosecuted from the port of New York, within the limits and jurisdiction of this diocese, in violation of the statutes of the republic, of the teachings of the Church, of the rights of man, and of the laws of God; to the end that such letter may be read in all the churches, and that the people may be warned, in the language of the Christian council of London, in 1102: "Let no man presume from henceforth to carry on that wicked traffic by which men have hitherto been sold like brute animals."

2. That the reverend clergy of this diocese be respectfully recommended from time to time to preach in their respective parishes against the wickedness of the slave trade, as now prosecuted from within this diocese.

3. That the laity of the diocese be urgently recommended to exert their influence, in all legitimate ways, to stay the further prosecution of the traffic from within the limits of the diocese.

Mr. JAY, having read his resolutions, proposed to address the Convention in explanation of his motives in offering them and of the reasons why they should be adopted. To this vehement objections were made by Doctors Vinton, Guyon, Creighton and others, on the ground that Mr. Jay was not in order; he had no right to speak *after* introducing his resolutions, though he might have done so, by way of explanation, before presenting them. A scene of great confusion and excitement ensued, Mr. Jay refusing to yield the floor, and many members urging that a motion to lay the resolutions on the table (made while he was on his feet and for the purpose of choking him down) was in order and should be put to the house. It *was* put and carried *unanimously*, and the Convention thereupon adjourned.

In the evening, Mr. JAY, profiting by the admission of his opponents that he had a right to speak in advance of offering resolutions, brought the subject forward again. He was violently opposed by certain members of the Convention; but the Bishop ruled that he was in order, and he proceeded, in spite of the evident uneasiness of many of the delegates. Mr. JAY said:

Speech of John Jay, Esq.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I rise to offer a resolution which I regard as of essential importance, not simply to the success, but to the continued existence of some of the foreign missions in which the Church in this diocese feels a profound interest. The Convention, perhaps, anticipate my announcement that I refer to our missions on the Western coast of Africa.

Mindful of the rule recognized by the Convention this morning, that a member has the right, in advance of the presentation of a resolution, to state its purport, his general views on the subject, and his reasons why it should be adopted, I shall proceed to follow the course, with such brevity as I may find convenient. I am glad, sir, that I have the opportunity of doing this with the Provisional Bishop in his seat as the presiding officer of this hour—our own Right Rev. Father, accustomed to preside over this Council of the Church with fairness, with consistency, and with courtesy, and who is alike able and ready to protect members in all their constitutional rights, and to maintain unimpaired that decency of procedure that should characterize this Convention, against all attempts, by whomsoever made, to interrupt its proceedings or compromise its dignity.

The danger, sir, that I anticipate to our mission on the Coast of Africa arises from the reëstablishment at our doors of the African slave trade; and I propose to present to the House what I think they will admit are convincing proofs that the trade is now more openly prosecuted than ever before, in defiance of the laws of God and of the Republic, from the city of New York—this seat of your Episcopate, within the limits and jurisdiction of this Diocese, and within the limits also of its oldest, wealthiest and most influential parish—the parish of Trinity.

I do not forget, sir, that when, at the last Convention, I presented a respectful petition from well known laymen on this subject, and asked its reference to a joint committee of both orders, the petition was received with a smile, and the motion promptly and by a large vote rejected. I remember well the scene and the vote, and I trust this Convention may remember them also, as I show to them that since that vote and the exultant comments it called forth from the pro-slavery press of the country, the slave trade from this port has increased with such frightful rapidity that the London *Times* pronounces the seat of your Episcopate to be "the greatest slave trading mart in the world."

It is, perhaps, proper that this House should be advised of the construction put upon the smiles and the vote of the last Convention by the London *Christian Observer*, that gentlemen may know how their reception of the petition was viewed by members of the Church of England. I will read but a single passage from the December number of that well-known and influential journal:

"We perceive from a New York paper—*The Evening Post*, Sept. 30—that even the Episcopal Convention treated with utter scorn a respectful and very moderate petition, setting forth that 'in defiance of the laws of God and of the statutes of this Republic, the African slave trade hath been reopened, and is now being prosecuted from the port of New York, within the limits and jurisdiction of the Diocese,' and praying for inquiry. Even the Episcopal Church, then, it appears, is quite prepared not merely to justify men-stealers, but to add the weight of its authority to their hideous cause."

Such was the painful conclusion of English Churchmen touching the meaning and effect of your scornful rejection of the resolution of reference; and while, from my personal acquaintance with members of this body, I freely acquit a large number of those who voted to reject the resolution of any intention of strengthening the slave trade by their vote, I as frankly declare that I believe the effect of their vote has been, as *The Christian Observer* hath it, "to add the weight of their authority to the hideous cause."

I think there is no room for doubting that the scene and the vote in the last Convention materially assisted in giving that fresh impulse to the trade during the past year that has aroused anew the indignation of Christendom at the insolent revival in the Diocese of New York of this infernal traffic that our fathers supposed they had extinguished more than half a century ago.

I am quite aware, sir, that the discussion of this topic will be excessively distasteful to many of the gentlemen whom I have the honor to address. They will, perhaps, do me the justice to remember that in the few remarks I made in presenting the anti-slave-trade petition I confined myself strictly to the propriety of referring the petition to a joint Committee to consider and report what action, if any, should be taken upon it. I said,

"I hope the Convention will not misunderstand the question. It is not whether the Convention ought to take any steps or not in regard to the actual prevention of the slave trade from our diocese, as certified by these petitioners. That is for the Committee to report upon. The only question here is, Shall the petition be referred quietly, without debate, without agitation—shall the Church, in calm consciousness of strength, treat this subject with composure, and deliberately ask what is her duty?"

For myself, opposed as I am by habit and on principle to all unnecessary agitation, I should have preferred that more quiet way of reaching a right decision on the question of duty to the one in which the refusal of the Convention to refer the petition has necessarily resulted. Forewarned, they acted as they had the power to act. Disapproving of that action, I nevertheless uncomplainingly acquiesced in it, and promptly relieved the anxiety of the Reverend Rector of St. George's by taking back the petition from your hands; and now, instead of addressing a joint Committee, I address myself directly and in open day to this Council of the Church, upon what the Bishop of Oxford rightly calls—morally, religiously and politically—the great question of this country and of this age.

Conscious of my utter inability to do justice to such a theme as the whole duty of the Church toward the crime of slave trading, its accessories and its results, I think it my duty, with such ability as I may, to open the subject to the House, well assured that the debate this day begun never will be ended until this Council, true to the teachings of the spirit of Christianity, to the teachings of the liturgy, and to the ancient precedents of the Church, shall exert her influence and authority to stay the slave trade now reopened at your door, and thus accomplish, to some extent at least, in the language of Lord Brougham, "the greatest triumph mortal ever won over the worst crime ever man committed."

In the first place, I ask your attention to proofs of the fact that the slave trade is being actually prosecuted from the port of New York, in this your diocesan limits and jurisdiction.

The St. Louis Intelligencer, published in a slave State, says:

"The reopening of the slave trade is an accomplished fact. . . . At this very time, cargoes of ignorant, barbarous and heathenish Africans, from Congo and Ashantee, are being landed in the inlets and creek-months of the gulf coast of Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana and Texas (I shall refer again to Texas presently), driven into the interior, and distributed among the cotton plantations. A fleet of vessels, fitted out in the ports of New Orleans and New York, is engaged in this prohibited traffic, and barracoons and depots have been established in the several large towns near the Gulf, where the freshly imported negroes are confined until they can be disposed of to the neighboring planters."

A correspondent of *The New York Times*, writing from on board the United States ship Portsmouth, on the coast of Africa, under date of December 20, 1859, says:

"The few months' experience we have had on the coast of Africa has not been altogether thrown away. It has thoroughly convinced us that *the whole coast is*, we may say, *lined with slavers, who are generally from New York*, cleared from the Custom House, bringing all the appliances of the trade with them, and manœuvring about on the coast under various pretences and disguises of legal traffic."

The writer proceeds to give an account of the capture of the brig Tavernier, of New York, by Her Majesty's ship Viper. It affords a glimpse of the character of the traffic, as prosecuted from this Diocese. He says:

"The brig Tavernier had nearly 600 slaves on board of her when captured. Most of them were mere children from eight to sixteen years old, with some women—all naked. When visited by the officers of the ship, although in better condition than when captured, the scene was frightful—some were dying, many sick, all miserable and suffering from the effects of cold, damp night air, producing bronchitis and cough. The officers were so horrified that they desire never again to look upon such a scene."

The *modus operandi* of shipping the negroes is thus described by the same writer:

"On the night determined on, they sail cautiously yet boldly in, anchor, and in two or three hours are filled with negroes, who are carried off to them in canoes. The refractory ones are clapped in irons, or made drunk with rum, and in this stupified condition they are carried on board, stowed in a sitting posture, with the knees drawn up so closely that they can hardly breathe, much less move.

"Now, their sufferings become dreadful, horrible—indeed language is incapable of describing or imagination of sketching even the faint outline of a dimly floating fancy of what their condition is. Home-sick, sea-sick, half-starved, naked, crying for air, for water—the strong killing the weak or dying, in order to make room—the hold becomes a perfect charnel-house of death and misery. . . . . Ophthalmia breaks out—every new case is thrown overboard, under the supposition that the disease is contagious and those who are dying meet the same fate. This is no fancy sketch; only the other day a remarkable instance of it came under our own observation."

The New York *Evening Post* published a list which I hold in my hand, prepared by one of its correspondents, "South Street," under date of July 28, 1860, of eighty-five slavers, under the American flag, from February, 1859, to July, 1860, derived from New York and English journals, a large portion of which sailed from New York. And another city journal, in commenting upon it, said:

"The conclusion is inevitable that this trade is at the present moment more active and more productive of profit to those engaged in it than in any former period, and that its management is concentrated in our own city."

The New York daily *World*, of July 31, 1860, remarks: "The fact that nearly a hundred slavers have been fitted out from this port within the last eighteen months, ought to arrest public attention."

In the Senate of the United States, Mr. Seward, in a debate on the African slave trade, declared that the trade was "an American trade, carried on from ports of the United States, acquiring slaves in Africa, and selling them either in the United States or Cuba." He said further, "the root of the evil is in great commercial cities, and I frankly admit, *in the city of New York*." And he added, "I say, also, that the objection I found to that bill (a bill he had introduced for the more effectual suppression of the traffic), came not so much from the slave States as *from the commercial interest of New York*."

Mr. President, I will not pursue this point; I do not suppose there is a sane man in this House who can doubt, upon the evidence I have adduced, that New York is, as the London *Times* declares, "the greatest slave trading mart in the world;" and they have the distinct assurance of our distinguished Senator, that the chief opposition to legislation for its suppression came not from the South, but from the commercial interests of this city—this seat of the Episcopate of New York.

I repeat his remark, for it disposes at once of the objection that by acting against the slave trade we would be meddling with the institutions of other dioceses, and shows that the African slave trade has become a diocesan institution peculiarly our own.

I might multiply similar proofs. I might refer you to the almost daily rumors in our papers of the slavers that leave our ports—of the charges of complicity made against the Marshal and his aids—of the straw bail accepted by Federal Commissioners—of constant acquittances of slave traders pronounced by judicial officers. I think it unnecessary, and pass to the question,

What is the duty of the Church touching the New York slave trade?

Some discussion has been had by Churchmen since the last Convention, in the columns of the public press, on the propriety of its action in refusing to refer the petition against the slave trade. And those who approved of that refusal rested their approbation of it on the ground, first, that the Episcopal Church in this country had always on principle avoided all interference with the question of slavery, and in the next place, that any resolution passed by the Convention against the trade would be a mere paper proclamation—a *brutum fulmen*—with no practical influence whatever.

These objections are frankly stated. They shall be as frankly answered.

The assertion that the American Church has uniformly avoided meddling with the slavery question has been so often and so confidently repeated that I am inclined to think many intelligent, honest people actually believe it. It has occasionally been put forth as an admitted truth by persons who might have been supposed to know something of our Church history. Many members of the Convention will remember that in 1846 the majority of the Special Committee to whom was referred the petition of St. Philip for admission, consisting of Messrs. John C. Spenser, Reuben H. Sherwood, and William M. Harrison, opposed the admission on the ground of the relation the question bore to "the vexed and irritating question of slavery;" and they remarked:

"By the wise and prud

vitude under the benign influence of Christian principles and Christian institutions."

I might refer, sir, to the newspapers of our Church openly taking the side of slavery in the contest which, during the last thirty years, has agitated the country, and to many clergymen of the North, some among them prominent divines of this Diocese, who, from the pulpit and in public speeches, have thrown all their influence into the scale of slavery, and, descending into the arena of politics, have attempted to persuade their congregations that the Fugitive Slave act, probably the most wicked statute enacted since that of Nebuchadnezzar in the time of Daniel, was a binding law, and that it was the duty of all good citizens to reverence it accordingly, and, in obedience to its mandates, to become slave-catchers and tipstaffs.

But I will not dwell on these facts, which are known to every one. I refer those who are curious in the matter of sermons, to the reports in our city papers during past years of the Thanksgiving sermons preached in our city churches on the subject—not of saving souls—but of saving slavery and the Union.

I come at once to a case which, if it stood alone, without another fact to support it, would dispel the illusion that the Episcopal Church in the United States has been neutral on the slavery question, and would show of itself how wide and fearful is the responsibility she has assumed in regard to the efforts that have convulsed the Union for the continuance and extension of slavery, as well as for the reopening of the African trade, now established in our Diocese.

In 1836, the Rev. George W. Freeman of Christ Church, Raleigh, in North Carolina, preached from that pulpit in the presence of his Bishop, the Right Rev. Dr. Ives, two sermons on the subject of slavery, in which, in the name of the Church, he declared that "Slavery, as it existed at the present day, was agreeable to the order of Divine Providence."

So far as an individual clergyman could do, he placed upon the system of slavery—not upon some ideal, imaginary system of compulsory labor, a patriarchal system, such as obtained with Abraham, or, as some suppose, with Paul and his brother beloved Onesimus—but upon "slavery as it *now exists*" he placed the seal of the Church, and blessed it in the name of the Head of the Church, and declared that "no man, without a new revelation from Heaven, was entitled to pronounce it wrong."

But it may be said, why hold the Church responsible for the rash utterances of a single member? Listen further.

Had Mr. Freeman been brought to trial before his Bishop on the charge of promulgating heresy and blasphemy, and prostituting the pulpit to the service of slave-traders, and bringing dishonor upon the Church and upon Christianity, the Diocese of North Carolina would have purged itself of his crime. But what did the Bishop? He recommended the publication of the sermons, "as urgently called for at the present time"; and they were published with his unqualified indorsement that he "had listened to them with the most unfeigned pleasure." The Diocese of South Carolina hastened to appropriate this new development of Church doctrines, which Dr. Dalcho had previously less fully announced, and the sermons were printed, *imprimatur* and all, as a religious tract, for gratuitous distribution, by "the Society for the advancement of Christianity," (!) with the Bishop of South Carolina at its head; and I submit that, by these proceedings the Protestant Episcopal Church in North Carolina and in South Carolina became the avowed champion of "slavery as it now exists."

It may be again urged that these are but two Dioceses out of twenty-five or thirty, and the Church at large has never indorsed Mr. Freeman, or even indirectly approved his teachings.

Until 1844 this may have been true. During those eight years the name of Mr. Freeman obtained an almost world-wide reputation as the boldest champion among all the sects of the South of American slavery. His sermons were quoted and commented on in newspapers, in pamphlets, in books, and at public conventions, both in America and in England.

The Bishop of Oxford, in his history of the American Church, quotes the sermons as evidence of "the fearful features of the life of churchmen at the South," and, based upon this and other evidences of the servility of the American Church to the base spirit of slavery, that famous chapter, which has been since so widely known from its reprint in separate form, as "The Reproof of the American Church"—a reproof which, from its dignity, its candor, and its power, was worthy alike of the Bishop of Oxford and of the son of Wilberforce.

The amazement of other English Bishops and clergymen at the utterance of such sentiments as those of Freeman was expressed with the utmost frankness. "I have always considered," said (in 1840) the Bishop of Norwich, referring to papers that contained extracts from Mr. Freeman's sermon, with Bishop Ives's indorsement, "I have always considered it an anomaly that any State professing Christianity could for a moment tolerate a tyranny so utterly at variance with every feeling of justice and humanity; but I never could have believed that any individuals existed, *calling themselves ministers of the Gospel*, whose minds were so darkened by prejudice and self-interest as to avow an approval of slavery and its evil consequences, had I not found them so unequivocally confirmed in the documents above mentioned."

The Archbishop of Canterbury, referring to slavery in America and its clerical supporters, remarked: "Christianity and slavery are not to be mentioned in the same day."

Eight years had elapsed since Mr. Freeman's sermons, with Bishop Ives's indorsement, and the sanction of two dioceses, had been sent forth to startle Christendom with the boldness of his assumptions. Politicians who had long professed to lament slavery as a moral evil—an unfortunate necessity—were prompt to accept the new gospel thus dispensed to them; and there arose a party who swore, almost in the words of Freeman, that slavery was divine in its character, and that it hence became a religious duty to strengthen, perpetuate, and extend it.

One feature of Freeman's defence of slavery is worth remembering, although it has been only partially adopted as yet by any political party. He did not rest his vindication of the system on the color of the slave, but maintained the historic approval by the Church of the slavery equally of blacks and whites.

The other sects of the South had exhibited great alacrity in complying with the demands of the Southern press to stand up for slavery, but "our denomination, as the Committee called the Church, were, by Mr. Freeman, placed prominently in the front rank of Slavery Propagandists, and his claim as the foremost leader in that propagandism was equally acknowledged by the friends and foes of slavery.

Eight years had elapsed, and the slavery question convulsed alike the religious and political world, and Churchmen at the North were earnestly appealed to to array themselves against the spurious Christianity that, under the lead of Freeman, was representing "slavery as it is" as a Christian institution. And at this time the General Convention met at Philadelphia to elect a bishop "to perform Episcopal services in the State of Arkansas, and in the Indian Territory South of 36 degrees 30 minutes, and to exercise Episcopal jusrisdiction over the missions of the Church in the State of Texas."

There was a wide field of influence—a Territory embracing more than three hundred and sixty three thousand square miles, about three times as large as Great Britain, to which the Church, as a nursing mother, was to give, in the infancy of its settlement, the first lessons of Christian civilization. Here she was to plant those principles which, taking root in the hearts of the early pioneers making their home in the wilderness, should bear fruit in distant generations, and on untold multitudes to the end of time.

In regard to Texas, the appointment was one of peculiar interest and importance, for a mild slavery had formerly existed there, which Mexican civilization, under the influence of the Roman Catholic Church, had abolished; and the American invaders who raised the standard of rebellion against Mexico, had done so avowedly, in part, for the reestablishment of slavery. And now, into this young State and Arkansas, and the Indian Territory, to teach them the doctrines of our Church, the General Convention was to send a bishop; and they had a long list of faithful clergymen in every part of our country from whom to choose.

Mr. President, after surveying the Territory to be supplied, and scrutinizing the list of clergymen, and reflecting, doubtless, upon the delicacy and importance of the step, morally, religiously and politically, the House of Bishops nominated for this post—the clerical and lay delegates confirmed the choice—and the Bishops consecrated and sent forth into the field as a Missionary Bishop—I assure the House I am not romancing; I can point you to the record—they actually chose and consecrated the Rev. George W. Freeman.

If they had selected and consecrated anew Bishop Leonidas Polk, with his hundreds of slaves—his field hands, and his women, and his children at $100 apiece—they could not have made a more significant appointment. Never was a choice more significant at the moment, more fraught with momentous consequences to endless generations. It was the scornful answer of the General Convention to the remonstrances and rebukes of English Bishops. It was their defiant answer to the Churchmen at home who believed slavery a crime. It was an assurance, clear and definite, to the slaveholding propagandists that the Episcopal Church did not regard a man less fit for the office of a bishop because he was the defender from the pulpit of a system that tramples upon marriage, that destroys the family relation, that dishonors the husband and insults the father, and exposes woman to the auction block and sells children by the pound.

And so this slavery propagandist was sent forth a bishop, to reprove, rebuke and exhort with all authority; and when the future historian of Arkansas and Texas shall trace to their sources the influences that have determined the character of their people, their degree of Christian civilization or African barbarism, their principles of freedom or of slavery, of morality or of crime, not least among those sources will be the vote of the General Convention at Philadelphia.

To form some idea of the inevitable effect of such doctrines as those of Mr. Freeman, it is only necessary to remember that in all ages of the world, and in every system of religion, the character of the system and the character of the people depend upon the idea embodied in their belief of the character of God.

The Odin and Thor of the Northmen were worshipped as hero kings, bloodthirsty and relentless, and their worshippers have been compared to bloodhounds.

In India the worshippers of Kalé, the most popular of idols, never dream of committing an act of unusual wickedness, without invoking the protecting power of their beastly deity; and in China, it is said, the priests of Buddha, perfectly understanding the doctrine of the assimilation of the worshipper to the object worshipped, say, "Think of Buddha, and you will be transformed into Buddha."

When, therefore, by the Bishop of Arkansas and Texas, God was represented as a being who viewed with approabtion "slavery as it is," brutalizing alike both master and slave, it was but natural that the qualities thus attributed to the Deity should be reproduced in the lives and characters of the people. Arkansas, in perfect consistency with Bishop Freeman's views of the excellence of slavery, has recently resolved to reduce to that blessed condition all the free negroes remaining in the State; and so determined are her people to allow no dissent from the pro-slavery doctrines taught them in the name of the Church, that a man is now under sentence of death, passed by a mob, for procuring for sale *The New York Tribune*.

Texas is actively engaged in obtaining slaves from Africa in the ships that sail from your diocese, and a mob in that State has just hung a Methodist missionary who, *The Christian Advocate* says, was "a devoutly pious and inoffensive man," on the charge of being an Abolitionist.

Who, in view of such fruits, the natural results of Bishop Freeman's teachings, will pretend that the voicé of the Church has no power, or that it will be less powerful for good when it utters truth and righteousness than it was for evil when it sanctioned Freeman's defence of slavery?

If any one shall suggest that neither the bishops nor the deputies to the General Convention knew of Freeman's championship of slavery when they made him a bishop, that they were ignorant of the sermons whose fame was so widely spread abroad, I reply that the suggestion is utterly incompatible with the known intelligence of those gentlemen, and with their habit of carefully scrutinizing the opinions and antecedents of their nominees for the Episcopate. Such an excuse is as clearly idle as it would have been had those same bishops selected and consecrated the late Dudley A. Tyng, of blessed memory, after the delivery of his immortal sermon on "Our Country's Troubles," to have urged that they had never heard of the sermon, that they knew nothing of his anti-slavery convictions, and that they, consequently, did not imply by their selection any approval of the doctrines he held on the catholic brotherhood of man.

Having shown that our General Convention practically sanctioned the teachings of Freeman that "Slavery as it exists is agreeable to the order of Divine Providence," let me ask you to note the fact, so pertinent to the matter before us, that those teachings have naturally resulted in the conclusion that the slave trade, also, is a proper thing.

"The conclusion," thus logically argues the Mississippian, "is irresistible, that if it is a heinous crime to purchase the African from his heathen master in his native country, it is equally wrong to purchase him from his enlightened master in one of the States of the Union. And, if it is radically wrong to import the black man for slavery, it is equally so to hold him in service anywhere. The principle involved is the same in each case, and the ingenuity of casuists cannot change it."

Accordingly, mercantile conventions and political meetings representing the influential classes at the South, have openly resolved to trample on the law, and to revive the traffic; and they have found in this city ready agents and greedy capitalists to do the work, and journals of commercial Christianity to harp on the necessity of a supply of labor and the duty of bringing the poor benighted African to a land of light and knowledge; and this abominable cant is unblushingly uttered by men the most prominent in your commercial circles, representative men, who help to make the character of your city. And here is a pamphlet—a plea for the slave trade—entitled "The Labor Question, by a New York Merchant," said to be by a churchman of this diocese, and, for all I know, by a member of the Convention.

Mr. President, I have shown that the assumed neutrality of our Church on the question of slavery has been, not neutrality, but acquiescence and approval; that the harmony of action in which gentlemen are solacing themselves has been a harmonious cooperation with the supporters and advocates of slavery, as united action on the side of the oppressor and against the oppressed; and I have shown, I think, that the legitimate results of that course are before you in the enslavement, in the diocese of Arkansas, of the free negroes, and in the revival, in your own diocese, of the African slave trade.

At all events, the fact is clear that the slave trade is an institution of the diocese, that it is vindicated as a Christian work by men claiming to be respectable, and by some, at least, calling themselves churchmen.

The question remains, what now is the duty of the Convention?

Mr. President, let me remind the House of the testimony borne against slavery and the slave trade both by the Church of Rome and the Church of England. Many Roman Pontiffs since Pius II., who, in 1462, in a letter to the Portuguese Bishop, condemned those who carried youth into slavery, including Paul III. in 1537, Urban VIII. in 1639, Benedict XIV. in 1748, and the late Gregory XVI. in 1839, have faithfully affirmed the truth. I will quote a part of the bull of the last named Pontiff:

"We desire to avert this disgrace from the whole confines of Christianity, having summoned several of our Reverend Brothers, their Eminences, the Cardinals, to our Counsel, and having maturely deliberated on the whole matter, pursuing the footsteps of our predecessors, admonish by our Apostolic authority and urgently invoke in the name of God all Christians, of whatever condition, that none henceforth dare to subject to slavery, unjustly persecute or despoil of their goods, Indians, negroes or other classes of men, or to be accessories to others, or furnish their aid or assistance in so doing, and on no account henceforth to exercise that inhuman traffic by which negroes are reduced to slavery as if they were not men."

The testimony of the English Church has been borne by her Prelates with no less distinctness. Take simply the sermons preached before the Society for the Propagation of Christianity, and you have the testimony of Bishop Fleetwood in 1711; and in the successive years of Bishop Claggett, Archbishop Secker, Bishop Warburton, Bishop Green, Bishop Newton, Bishop Lowth, Bishop Edmund Law, Bishop Thurlow, Bishop Moore, Bishop Warner, Bishop Bagot, Bishop Prettyman, Bishop Sutton and Bishop Vernon, not forgetting those eminent prelates Bishop Burgess, Bishop Porteus and Bishop Horsly, all of the last century, and the countless English bishops and clergymen of the present century down to the Lord Bishop of Oxford, who has administered so timely and faithful a rebuke to the American Church, for not standing, as she should have done, between the living and the dead and staying the plague that so infects our country.

Mr. President, if this Church Council shall refuse to act in reference to the slave trade at its own door, it will not be from want of precedent on the part of the Church. Go back to far antiquity, and you have the voice of St. Cyprian writing to the Bishops of Numidia.

"Both religion and humanity make it a duty for us to work for the deliverance of the captives. . . . It is Jesus Christ himself whom we ought to consider in our captive brothers. It is him we should deliver from captivity, him who hath delivered us from death."

Trace the history of the Church through long centuries of darkness, and you hear the same voice time and again repeated. Come down to the Christian Council held in London, 1102, and you hear the mandate go forth: "Let no man henceforth presume to carry on that wicked traffic by which men have hitherto been sold in England like brute animals;" and see slavery in England fade before that mandate as mist fades before the sun. Listen to the voice of popes, and bishops, and clergymen down to your own day. Listen to the voice of a former clergyman of this diocese, now the Right Rev. Bishop of Maryland, in referring to the poor black groaning in slavery. Said Dr. Whittingham, "Oh, that his sighs and tears be not bottled up for witnesses against us—that his moral degradation, and, far worse, the eternal ruin which must too often be its fruit, be not requited at our hands."

Mr. President, clear as my own views are of the duty of this Convention to exert its authority as a Council of the Church to put an end to this traffic, and firm as is my belief that the Church, by her influence, can so purify public opinion as to give efficacy to the law of the land that declared it piracy, punishable with death, I am well aware that the force of prejudice and habit is hard to overcome, and that perhaps some gentlemen really anxious to come to the right decision may hesitate to take the step.

I have had the opportunity during the twenty-six years that have elapsed since I was honored by a seat in this body to learn something of the temper of this House and the character of its members.

I adopt with perfect confidence the language of a reverend rector of this diocese, which I find in a communication to *The Evening Post*, vindicating this Convention from the inferences drawn by *The London Christian Observer* from the vote and the "titter" that greeted the petition which I last year had the honor to present. The reverend rector said:

"When the New York Convention supposes its vote will influence the slave trade, and its responsibility is felt in this relation, I am much mistaken if it be not found full of hearts true to God and to humanity."

I firmly believe it. After the vote on the question of St. Philip's, if no other evidence were afforded me beyond my personal acquaintance with honorable and reverend members of this body, I could not doubt it. With all the clamor of a demoralized press, teeming with charges of fool-hardy fanaticism, with all the efforts within and without this House to deter members from voting for the recognition of a race who were declared to be "socially degraded and improper associates for the class of persons who attend our Convention;" with all the threatening intimidation that the subject was a "fireband," belonging to "the vexed and irritating subject of slavery," and that the admission of St. Philip's would give mortal offence to the slaveholding bishops and clergy of the South; in the face of these adverse influences, when it was, after long years, brought to a vote, the clerical vote stood, to the amazement of the world, Yeas, 140; Nays, 13.

— More than ten to one for purifying the Church from a heathenish caste and for recognizing the negro as an equal brother, in defiance of the popular cry, since reechoed from the bench, that "the black man has no rights that the white man is bound to respect."

Mr. President, for that vote I owe to the clergy of this Diocese my eternal thanks, and I now proffer them from an overflowing heart.

That vote tended to stay the tide of infidelity that had its source in the belief that our clergy, with their devotion to forms and to rubrics, were indifferent to the great underlying principles of Christian unity and catholic brotherhood. It deprived the wicked system of caste, that has at times crushed the colored man in the free States almost to the level with the slave, of the support that the conduct of our Diocese had previously afforded it.

The vote dispelled the illusion that because this Convention was a conservative body, it must needs throw its protecting arms around false doctrine, cruelty, and wrong, and look with coldness on "the desolate and the oppressed." It is true that the members of this Council are conservative, but they are not of that class of conservatives who, had they lived at the dawn of creation, would have been agonized at the idea of light, and have besought God to preserve chaos.

That vote, sir, gives me as absolute a confidence of success in the present movement to array the Church against the slave trade that has now become an institution of the Diocese, as if the vote were already recorded by the Reverend Secretary, and the authoritative mandate had gone forth, in the words of the Christian Council of London, already quoted, "Let no man from henceforth presume to carry on that wicked traffic by which men are sold like brute animals."

My trust is that such a vote may be recorded at this present session, but if the Convention are prepared to assume the fearful responsibility of delay, may I venture to express the hope that the opposition to this movement may not be marked by the disregard of constitutional righs, of parliamentary rules and of parliamentary courtesy that marked for years the opposition to St. Philip's. May I venture to suggest that to allow the Secretary to mutilate the journal, and destroy the integrity of our records, will be alike unprincipled and inexpedient; and will be regarded as an admission by the Convention that their votes will not bear the light, at the very time they are voting in the presence of the world.

I am induced to make this remark because I find, by reference to the last journal, that the habit, systematically adopted, of mutilating the journal and omitting resolutions, votes, and proposed canons that might be distasteful to the majority, which obtained during the struggle of St. Philip's, has been now renewed in regard to the slave trade. No mention is made of my resolution of reference to a joint committee, but only a blind statement that I offered a paper which the Convention refused to accept.

I shall offer no resolutions which I shall be ashamed to have recorded in *my* name, and if the Convention think proper to reject them, let them not shirk the responsibility of *their* vote; and I hope that hereafter the Reverend Secretary, with a due regard to his duties and to my rights, will record any and every resolution which, as a member of this Council, I shall have the honor to offer in *ipsissimis verbis*, without the addition of a word or the omission of a letter.

But I trust, I sincerely trust, Mr. President, there will be no delay on the part of this body in acting upon this subject. Since the last Convention scores of slavers have left our port, and tens of thousands of victims have been torn from their homes and consigned to misery, slavery, and death. If any better course can be devised for arraying the great authority and influence of this Church against the traffic, than that proposed in the resolution I now offer you, let it be suggested, but let us so act that if during the coming year even one slaver shall sail from our port, or one African be reduced to slavery, the awful responsibility for the crime shall not rest on our heads, nor his blood be demanded at our hands.

I offer, sir, the following resolution:

Whereas, The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States have, through their Board of Foreign Missions, established various missions on the coast of Africa, and this Convention feels a strong interest in the success of the said missions as the means for the conversion of Africa to the principles and practices of Christianity. And whereas, it has been made to appear to this Convention that a class of persons residing in the diocese of New York are engaged in sending vessels to the western coast of Africa, with the view of kidnapping and reducing to slavery large numbers of the said people; and it is publicly pretented and asserted that the doctrine of Christianity justifies and approves of the enslaving men, women and children, and reducing them to the condition of chattels; and there is good reason to believe that the said trade will interfere materially with the said mission, and that a belief on the part of the Africans that those who engage in the African slave trade are Christians, may indispose the Africans so believing to embrace Christianity, and lead them to reject with scorn and indignation the teachings of our missionaries. Therefore

Resolved, That this Convention, in order to prevent all misapprehension in regard to the position of the Church in this Diocese on the subject of the slave trade, do hereby declare and announce that the Convention do utterly reject the doctrine that men may be lawfully kidnapped and held in slavery by any other person, and do utterly condemn the said practice as a great sin against God and man, and do adopt, in regard thereto, the words of St. Cyprian, in writing to the Bishop of Numidia: "Both religion and humanity make it a duty for us to work for the deliverance of the captive. . . . It is Jesus Christ, himself, of whom we ought to consider in our captive brother. It is Him whom we should deliver from captivity—Him who hath delivered us from death."

Mr. JAY, was frequently interrupted in the delivery of his address by the discussion of points of order, which the Bishop decided in Mr. Jay's favor, at the same time appealing to the Convention to maintain silence, as well as by the disorderly behavior of a number of members, who left the house with such noise and confusion as for some minutes to interrupt the quiet of the Convention.

These interruptions continued until a late hour, compelling some abridgments of the speech in the delivery. On concluding, some discussion was had by several gentlemen, including the Rev. Dr. Vinton, who appealed to Mr. Jay to withdraw his resolution. This Mr. Jay distinctly declined to do.

The Rev. Mr. Leonard then moved that it be laid on the table, and the vote, by orders, being called for, the vote stood:

Clergy—Yeas	54	Laity—Yeas	54
Nays	6	Nays	6

Whereupon the Convention adjourned.

On the following day (Friday), Mr. J. B. SILKMAN, of Somers, brought the subject up again by the introduction of the following preamble and resolution:

Whereas, The action of the late Convention of this Diocese, in refusing to refer a petition there presented, praying an inquiry into "the duty of the Convention touching the prosecution of the African slave trade from the port of New York, within the limits and jurisdiction of the diocese," has excited much remark at home and abroad; and *The London Christian Observer* has remarked thereon in these words:

"Even the Episcopal Convention there is quite prepared not merely to justify 'men-stealers' but to add the weight of its authority to their hideous cause."

And, whereas, Such an interpretation of the action of the said Convention, from so respectable a source, is calculated, if uncontradicted by this body, not simply to bring reproach and odium on the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, and to give a great impulse to immorality and infidelity, but also to encourage and strengthen the African slave trade, as prosecuted from the port of New York, and embolden the prosecutors thereof to defy the laws of their country and of God, and to prosecute with impunity the said trade in their fellow-creatures. Therefore

Resolved, That this Convention, for the purpose of preventing all such misapprehension and evil consequences, doth hereby unanimously declare that, so far from approving or tolerating the said trade, or regarding it as one that may be innocently prosecuted under any circumstances whatsoever, doth reprobate and condemn the buying and selling of human beings, or the holding of them in slavery after they have been so bought and sold, as contrary to the doctrines of the Church and to the Word of God, and as constituting a very fearful and wicked crime. And this Convention doth call upon all members of the Church in this diocese, by the authority of the Church and in the name of God, to set their face against all traffic in human beings—to remember that the victims of said trade, and all human beings whatsoever, are equally, with themselves, the children of Our Father who is in Heaven, and that if they fail to do unto these, their brethren, as they would be done by, and continue to make merchandise of the sons of God, they may justly fear his wrath, which of old he visited on those who, in the words of Scripture, dealt in "slaves and the sons of men."

Efforts were made to stop the reading of the resolutions by raising points of order, which were overruled by the chair (Rev. Dr. Creighton); but the Convention at length, on appeal, refused to sustain the President, and Mr. Silkman was not allowed to finish the reading. Soon afterwards the Convention adjourned *sine die*.

THE EPISCOPALIANS AND THE SLAVE TRADE.

We print in another part of this morning's paper the sound, forcible, and modest speech which Mr. John Jay was at length enabled to make before the Episcopal Convention on Thursday evening. Compelled in the morning by the enforcement of a point of order to forego the statement of reasons which impelled him to bring the subject of the foreign slave trade before the Convention, he availed himself in the evening of the ruling of the Chair to present those reasons at length. The action asked for by him was little more than a declaration on the part of the Convention that the Church regarded the slave trade as a crime. There was certainly nothing unreasonable in such a proposition, and it was urged on the ground that the slave trade had been illegally revived within the jurisdiction of the Convention, and that its permanent reestablishment was advocated under the plea of Christian benevolence, and was claimed to be sanctioned by the doctrines of the bishops and clergy of the South; that the Church from the time of St. Cyprian down to the Christian Council of London in 1102, had condemned the trade; that the last Council had abolished the traffic in England by a brief mandate; and that a reaffirmation of that canon by the Church here would put the Church in her true position, would purify public opinion, and leave the slave trade in its naked infamy, a thing to be execrated by every honest man. A request so moderate as this, respectfully and earnestly made on behalf of the hundreds of thousands of the poor victims of this trade, was received in a manner unworthy of any body of Christian men. Instead of recognizing the gravity of the question, and listening composedly to the arguments to be advanced, they resented this attack upon the slave trade, as if the members had a personal interest in keeping silence upon the subject. The most absurd points of order were put forth with learned assumption, but without the slightest regard to Parliamentary rules, constitutional rights, or Parliamentary courtesy. Reverend gentlemen sprang to their feet, and with fierce gesticulation and excited speech, attempted to silence the gentleman who had the floor. Insolent attempts of even gray-haired men were made to bully the Chair into a reversal of his decision; and the speaker was again and again interrupted when declared by the Bishop to be in order. And when these attempts to get rid of the subject failed, they were succeeded by a stampede of angry men from the Church, shuffling down the aisles of what they profess to consider a holy place with intentional tumult—young and old, clergy and laity, uniting to turn what the Prayer Book calls "the Council of the Church here assembled in God's name and presence" into a disorderly meeting, by conduct more befitting an excited political caucus than a religious assembly. The gentle presence of the Bishop, exercising a mild but firm and impartial authority, feeling evidently profound mortification at the disgraceful behaviour of his flock, and urging them by look and voice to silence and decency, and the dignity of the speaker himself, were the only redeeming features of this melancholy spectacle.

The Convention has adjourned, and if the diocesan slave trade shall flourish under its protecting silence this year, as it did last, the members who, to shield the trade from rebuke, voted down every proposition to condemn it, may see the result of their labors in the reports of the daily journals. On the very day that the Episcopal Church of this diocese refused to utter a condemnation of this unhallowed trade, it is announced that two New York slavers have been seized, with 1,500 slaves on board, in foreign waters.

We know on what plea these gentlemen half deceive themselves into the belief that it is not their business to condemn the trade; but they cannot long delude themselves in the face of facts with so groundless an excuse. To stop the trade, to strengthen the palsied hands of the Federal authority, to purify public opinion, to make the Church, as it ought to be, the standard of truth and the shield of the oppressed, they had only to speak the word. Then their consciences would have been clear. They have permitted the opportunity to escape them. But when these honorable and reverend men awaken, as they some time will, from their delusion, they will realize the awful responsibility they have assumed. The time may come when they will remember with regret their cowardly and criminal silence, and will shrink from contemplating their work. The voice of conscience may then sternly declare to each of them, in tones to which they must listen, "Thou art the man."
—*Tribune.*

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, CCTOBER 6, 1860.

CORRESPONDENTS will greatly oblige us by a careful observance of the following directions, viz.:

Letters enclosing matter for publication, or relating in any way to the editorial conduct of the paper, should be addressed, "EDITOR OF THE ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, No. 5 BEEKMAN STREET, NEW YORK."

Letters enclosing subscriptions, or relating in any way to the business of the office, should be addressed, "PUBLISHER OF THE ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, No. 5 BEEKMAN STREET, NEW YORK."

A COUNTERFEIT EXPOSED.

ONE of the strongest accusations made against the Masonic fraternity, and one which, if proved true, would justify all the fears that were entertained respecting the character and influence of that body, was the charge that they promised, and were accustomed, to help each other in time of need, and to obey the directions of their leaders, irrespective of the laws of the land, and irrespective of the right or wrong of the case.

A large society, comprising persons of wealth, power and influence, acting upon a rule like this, would indeed be most dangerous to justice and to freedom. This is the very tree that bore such pernicious fruit under the cultivation of the Jesuits. And it is this same custom, the persistent recognition of wrong as right, for the sake of justifying and upholding delinquent "brethren," that makes the Church, to the present day, the great bulwark of slavery. The Church will not consent, for the mere sake of justice and righteousness, to lose so large a proportion of her members as must inevitably be excommunicated if slaveholding is admitted to be sin. On the other hand, she *must*, for decency's sake, do something to avert the just reproach of complicity with slavery. So some of the Northern leaders of the Church devise this method of accomplishing both purposes. They speak strongly against slavery as an evil, sometimes stigmatize it as a sin, and show a great deal of zeal against some of the grosser manifestations of it, but take care so to frame their definition of slavery, and so to limit and qualify their opposition to it, that slaveholders may continue church-members "in good standing," and newly "converted" slaveholders become church-members, without, in the slightest degree, changing their relation to their slaves.

Such is the position of that portion of the "religious" press in the North which is currently reputed to be "Anti-Slavery." Such is the position of the Boston Tract Society. Such is the position of that class of Northern ministers to which the editors of *The Independent* belong. And all these ignore or oppose Dr. Cheever's "Church Anti-Slavery Society," because the stand taken by that (however exceptionable in some particulars) is more thorough than their own.

We have heretofore pointed out the dishonesty of Dr. Joseph P. Thompson of *The Independent*, in first opposing Dr. Cheever's resolution against slaveholding, then causing to be substituted for it a form of expression which, seeming to condemn slavery, would yet allow the recognition of slaveholders as worthy members of a Christian Church—and finally boasting of his part in this transaction as a proof of his anti-slavery zeal and thoroughness. *The Independent*, convinced by the remonstrance of one of its own correspondents that this position needs defence, devotes a couple of columns (Sept. 13th) to that purpose.

The correspondent declares his belief that the use of the *word* "slaveholding," for the purpose of effective opposition to slavery, "is much the simpler and better way"; and he asks why the use of that word is objectionable.

In reply, *The Independent* maintains that, in the general condemnation of slavery, it is needful to provide for certain exceptional cases which are *not* to be condemned; and, quoting the concession of one whom it calls a "Garrisonian Abolitionist"—that "a Southern planter who should gather his slaves around him and tell them that although the laws forbade him to emancipate them on the soil, he would nevertheless treat them as free men, giving them wages, protecting them in the family relation, and in freedom of will and of conscience, would be free from guilt, though living still under the legalized system of slavery"—it proceeds to affirm that this person *is* a slaveholder, and to represent that the condemnation of slavery must be so phrased as not to impugn his character.

To this, two things are to be said.

In the first place, one of the distinctions between real and spurious Abolitionists, between the thorough and the partial or merely pretended opposers of slavery, is that the former are not concerned to provide for the credit of possible exceptional cases. Their object is to abolish and utterly annihilate that thing called slavery, by which men and women are bought and sold like cattle. If there be any exceptions to the guilt of this system, let them look out for themselves. We are not concerned to provide for them, or to give them certificates of good character. And if there is any honest abhorrence of slavery *in them*, they will not desire, still less seek, such consideration at our hands. They will not wish that their good intentions should be made in the slightest degree a shield to the abominable system in the meshes of which they find themselves entangled. If there be a case where a person of this sort thinks there are sufficient reasons for his *seeming* voluntarily to continue a slaveholder, he will *infinitely* prefer that this seeming should, for the present, redound to his discredit, rather than that his good character and good intentions should be an apology for slavery, and should be openly quoted in justification of it. And if such a person should desire membership in a Christian Church (of course he would decline union with a pro-slavery Church of the popular religion, North or South), he would necessarily curb that desire, saying to himself—and, if needful, to others—"I am not authorized to ask this privilege! Even if (possibly) I am free from guilt, my position is such as to bring reproach on a Christian Church. I seem, in the eyes of my neighbors and the public, to be connected with an atrocious system of wickedness; a system against which every Christian Church must utter constant and emphatic condemnation; far rather let me postpone the comfort and the credit of such a connection until I can free myself from this disgrace, than bring reproach upon this Church, and upon the cause of Christ, by making them seem to recognize a slaveholder as a Christian!"

The other thing which needs to be said in reply to *The Independent's* sophistry is, that the practice of slaveholding is an injury and a disgrace to the community in which it exists, as well as to the slaves who are its victims; and that every slaveholder is bound by the strongest obligations of morality and religion, not only to the exercise of immediate repentance and reformation in regard to his slaves, but to the *manifestation* of such repentance and reformation before the community. If he has been what is falsely called "a kind master," it is immensely important that he should take away from the cruel masters in his neighborhood the opportunity of bolstering up slavery by reference to his good character; and that he should no longer leave even the silent influence of that good character to stand as a snare and a stumbling-block in the way of those who are secretly feeling the reproaches of conscience in regard to their connection with slavery, and wavering between an immediate and a future separation from it. And, apart from all these particular circumstances, it is the duty of the repentant slaveholder to let his light "shine before men," and to let such influence as he may have tell as effectively on the right side as it formerly did on the wrong.

Proceeding with *The Independent's* article, we find that it specifies as noteworthy a consideration which all defenders of slavery, North and South, quote as giving material aid and comfort to their side. We will place a sentence from this article by the side of one from Rev. Dr. Lord, President of Dartmouth College, one who has for thirty years been zealous and active in behalf of slavery. Both appeal to the letter of Scripture for the purpose of sheltering slaveholders from condemnation.

DR. LORD.

"The question is not whether this species of property [slaves] may be acquired rightfully by mere rapine, fraud or stealth, or used for nefarious purposes, or regulated by tyrannical and oppressive laws—for that question would be absurd—but whether God forbids it to be acquired, held, or used *at all*; *that is*, whether it is prohibited in Scripture."

THE INDEPENDENT.

"It is certainly worthy of note that while the general principles of the New Testament, and many of its specific precepts, are thoroughly hostile to slavery, this particular term *slaveholding* does not occur in any phrase or form of condemnation."

What makes it "worthy of note," in the eyes of *The Independent*, that the *word* "slaveholding" is not mentioned with censure in the New Testament? It is that the teachers of the popular religion in this country have so guided men into allegiance to the letter rather than the spirit of Christ's teachings, that the negative fact, that this particular word is not used in any text of condemnation, will go further towards establishing tolerance of slaveholding in the Church, than the admitted hostility of the *principles* of the New Testament to that custom will avail to excite the efforts of church-members against it. In short, the intellectual, moral and religious education of the representatives of piety has been so conducted, that they may be successfully appealed to to welcome slaveholders as Christian brethren, and thus most effectively to help keep the slaves in subjection, if only it be first surely settled that the *word* slaveholding has not been coupled with apostolical censure!

The Independent is not ashamed to dwell upon this pitiful device of word-catching, as if it were argument. It proceeds to say—"In framing a definition, the question is whether the legal act of slave*holding*, and holding and treating a slave as *property*, are always identical. If they are, why did not Paul say slaveholders as well as men-stealers, in his condemnation?" And again—"There must have been a reason why Paul used one term and not the other."

Having thus gained its first point, of securing to slaveholders a "right of way" into the Church, *The Independent* proceeds to its secondary object, a *seeming to oppose* slavery. And it energetically says—"We hold emphatically that *the holding human beings as property is a sin, without qualification or exception.*"

The practical result of this is, that *The Independent* (other things being equal) is willing to embrace as Christian brethren all those slaveholders who have impudence enough to say, when examined (or rather *if* examined), that they do not hold their slaves "as property." An answer, by the way, which would not in the least prevent their continuing regularly to buy and sell in the slave-market.

But *The Independent* proceeds to try to enlist in its favor the wide-spread popularity of certain eminent men, whose half anti-slavery it would have its readers regard as the genuine and perfect article. It asks these questions, which we will answer, with one sufficient reason in each case.

"Who doubts that Senator Sumner is as thorough and sincere as Wendell Phillips in his opposition to slavery?"

ANSWER.—*We* doubt it; because he continues one of the leaders and public advocates of a party which declares its determination to *support* slavery in the existing slave States.

"Who doubts that Mr. Beecher is as sincere, and hearty, and earnest in opposition to slavery as Dr. Cheever himself?"

ANSWER.—*We* doubt it; because he recently, after hearing elaborate and demonstrative proof of the pro-slavery character and policy of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, gave his full influence in its favor, perverting truth as well as justice in its defence, and thus effectively helping the most powerful helper of slavery. It should be noted here that Dr. Cheever, the most vigorous opposer of the pro-slavery policy of this Society, objects only to this feature in its operations, and is as actively favorable to the Missionary cause as Mr. Beecher himself.

A BLOOD-GUILTY CHURCH.—Our columns this week afford a new and vivid illustration of the moral blindness which, to a greater or less extent, appears to have settled upon all the great religious denominations of the land, insomuch that they have become the chief bulwarks of the most gigantic system of iniquity that has ever cursed the race of man; an illustration also of the worldliness which in our day is baptized in the name of Christ, and which teaches men that the obligations of the gospel and the conditions of salvation are fulfilled by assent to a creed, diligence in the use of external rites, and zeal for extending the power and influence of a sect; an illustration, in other words, of the *Churchianity* which unscrupulous men in pulpits seek to impose upon the world, and which deluded thousands eagerly accept for the *Christianity* of the New Testament. It is hardly necessary to say that we allude to the action of the Diocesan Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, held last week in this city, upon the subject of the slave trade, brought to its notice by the timely, courageous, and persistent efforts of JOHN

cal to any existing society or anti-slavery agency whatever: that we could all work for the slave, *in our own way*, and go on harmoniously together; and by these means slavery would be brought to a peaceful end. He thought that the Abolitionists in the Church had better remain in the Church and purify it. Certainly it is better for H. W. Beecher to remain in the Church. What could he do if he left it? Nothing—his influence would be gone. It was the duty of Beecher and others like him to remain with the Church and purify it.

Deacon Greene, of the Baptist Church in Peterboro, also deprecated the denunciatory language of Mr. P., and said that the Church to which he belonged had long ago passed a vote to exclude slaveholders from the pulpit and communion table. He believed this severe language did no good, but much harm, and expressed his approval of the views of Mr. Cheever, and the formation of a Church Anti-Slavery Society.

Elder Downer, Baptist, followed in a similar strain. He thought these severe denunciations of the Church did no good, and he claimed that there were more Church members at this moment engaged in the anti-slavery work than of non-professors, and that these had done the most that had been done for the advancement of the slave's cause.

Mr. Putnam inquired, "Who are these men, and where are they at work?"

"In the Republican party," said the Elder; "the slaveholders don't care for your Garrisons, and Phillipses, and Pillsburys, and Fosters; the men they fear are such men as Seward, and Lincoln, and Sumner—*voting men*; and, in my opinion, it is of little use to form Church Anti-Slavery Societies. I would have you form 'Wide-Awake Clubs,' and all go in together to elect 'honest old Abe!'"

Mr. Putnam replied, "that all the anti-slavery sentiment of the nation had been created by the American Anti-Slavery Society and the radical Abolitionists; the little of good that existed in the Republican party came from these sources, and the fact that the candidate of the Republican party is in favor of slave-catching shows to what an extent it can be called an anti-slavery party. and repeated that the Wesleyans, Old School Covenanters, and a few small bodies of professing Christians which have been mentioned, together with here and there a member of the Orthodox and Presbyterian Churches, constitute the *exceptions* of which he had spoken; these were the *living*, who ought to leave the dead and come out from all complicity with a slavery-sustaining Church. Why, the *deadliest enemies* of George B. Cheever, and the Church of the Puritans, is this very body of professing Christians—this very den of hypocrites and tyrants, upon which the Cheevers are wasting their precious energies in the vain effort to convert them to a love of truth and liberty! and of what use is it to talk of here and there a little Baptist, or Methodist, or Congregational Church, having passed resolutions not to commune with the slaveholder? These Churches are still bound by many ties to the great Baptist and Methodist, Presbyterian and Congregational bodies. which *aid* and *abet* in *every way the slaveholder in his accursed work!* The very Churches who have passed such votes, from their isolated position in little country towns and villages of the North, never see a slaveholder—no such fiend ever comes and asks to commune with them; but they *do* receive, and *treat as Christians*, those ministers and Church members who *do* every day *aid* and *abet* slaveholding with all its horrors, and thus become themselves, in spite of their boasted 'vote not to commune with slaveholders,'—the *willing accomplices* in the guilt of slaveholding! I know this is but a miserable subterfuge, and as such I expose it. Mr. Cheever asks if H. W. Beecher should come out of the American Church? I answer, yes!—by all means! What is the trouble with Beecher? What is the reason that he vacillates and is never to be depended upon in a severe contingency? It is because of his connection with this heartless Church? Look at his late course on the Foreign Mission question, backing down at the moment he should have stood like a rock! Let him come out of that Church, and if its members will not follow him by thousands, then there are warmer and truer hearts and better material in the wide world around to gather and sustain him than he ever found within the Church. Let him come out, and let that false Church take hold of him, as it will if he dares come out; it will hammer him into *flint*, and make him of some use to the world, while now he is of but little use, blowing, as he does, both hot and cold! It is useless to talk of the existence of a latent love of justice and truth in the American Church. If any such thing existed, it COULD NOT have remained inoperative for a quarter of a century, while the great battle for human freedom raged and shook the land; still less could it have done the dark and hateful work it has done against the cause of human rights."

Mr. Cheever asserted that there was no excuse for the Church not having done its duty in its own way these many years past, but he thought that the Church had begun to see its guilt, and that there were some signs of repentance visible; and he thought that this movement would have the effect to quicken that feeling of sorrow; and, as Gerrit Smith had to-day remarked to him, this new movement would be a *final test* of the character of the American Church, and as such it was highly useful; and if it could not stand this test, and would not now come up and do its duty, then the world would see its *true* character demonstrated and settled forever.

Gerrit Smith was present, but declined speaking. He remarked that he was not a member of the American Church, and, of course, could not become a member of this Church Anti-Slavery Society. He had long stood *outside* of the American Church, but he was glad this new movement was made, for it would be a final test of the character of the American Church, and he could not conceive how any member of that Church, calling himself a *Christian*, could possibly refuse to join this new movement, and aid to his utmost to ensure its success.

Hon. James Barnett moved the adoption of the resolutions. Carried.

Mr. Cheever's visit to Peterboro has been a very pleasant one to himself, to Mr. Smith and his family, and to all who have had the pleasure of meeting him. The noble stand which his eminent brother and himself have taken for human freedom has endeared them to many hearts, and the kind and candid manner in which he received the objections to his favorite scheme, and his manly acknowledgment of the services of the American Anti-Slavery Society and the Radical Abolitionists of this country, indicated the noble Christian heart which prompts his efforts to redeem the slave.

Yours, G. W. P.

"KIRWAN" AND HIS SLANDERS.

NEW YORK, Oct. 1st, 1860.

To the Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SIR: I beg to call the attention of the readers of THE STANDARD to the following sentences in "Kirwan's" (Rev. Dr. Murray's) letter in *The Observer*, which you republished on the 22d of September:

"On the morning of the day on which the meeting was to be held in the evening, two violent letters appeared in two papers, denouncing us in terms as bitter as any could desire, and calling upon the good people of "the modern Athens" to eschew us. Your correspondent was especially denounced, and his brethren were exhorted to flee from him as from a pestilent person. We should like to reproduce this effusion, as a specimen of Scotch fanaticism and truthlessness; but we have *laid it away so carefully that we cannot find it.* The Committee came to see us, to know what to do. We told them to go on with their meeting; that, as we were pledged for addresses, we would make them, and that, if they stood by us, we were ready to risk the consequences, and to meet any uproar. They agreed to stand by us, and we prepared for the evening. The theatre was densely crowded. *A man by the name of Ritchie*—we heard him called *Jockie Ritchie—once an Independent minister, but now, we learned, a dependent one, was there, with some of his followers.*"

It is observable how convenient it was for "Kirwan" that he laid away the document to which he refers "so carefully that he could not find it." The question suggests itself, "would he like, after finding it, to give it due publicity?" It would, beyond all doubt, be interesting for us to have that "specimen of Scotch fanaticism and truthlessness," in THE STANDARD, where we could "find it." If we are left to the Rev. gentleman's own standard of "truthlessness," a specimen of which is given in his episode upon "Jockie Ritchie," as a basis upon which to judge of his veracity, then our opinion of him as a minister of the gospel must be lower than we have before entertained.

The "man by the name of Ritchie," referred to as "Jockie Ritchie," is none other than the distinguished Rev. John Ritchie, D.D., formerly the popular and beloved pastor of the Potter-row United Presbyterian Church, Edinburgh. In Edinburgh he has never been known by a worse name than "Potter-row John," excepting in the lowest society, where the rumsellers' title has been "Jock Ritchie." This contemptuous cognomen, however, was Dr. Ritchie's reward for insisting upon the "duty of the Church to oppose intemperance." Persons at all acquainted with the Scottish dialect will at once decide that Dr. Murray must have chosen for himself and friends poor society, for the nickname "Jockie" belongs to the lower strata, and respectable people, especially in Edinburgh, never use it.

Dr. Ritchie is not "dependent." He some years ago retired from the ministry, a step which his health demanded that he should take, unless he burdened his Church by remaining its pastor while they would also have had to pay an assistant. He chose to release the Church from such a weight because he was sufficiently rich in this world's goods to live without the Church's support. His antecedents will compare very favorably with those of Dr. Murray. Unlike him, however, he believes that revivals cannot be "raised" when the true elements upon which they subsist are wanting. Then, too, Dr. Ritchie is a temperance man; Dr. Murray is not. Dr. Ritchie is an anti-slavery man; Dr. Murray is not. Dr. Ritchie is a fearless man; Dr. Murray is not. Dr. Ritchie is a natural wit; Dr. Murray is not.

It is exceedingly strange to find that Irishmen like Dr. Murray, who have long since found out that Popery was Ireland's tyrant, should join hands with popish bishops and priests and devotees to uphold American slavery. It is, indeed, passing strange when such Irishmen profess to be Christ's ministers of glad tidings to all people. H.

POLITICAL RELATIONS.—VI.

To the Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

IN describing the position I am intent on maintaining amidst my political relations, I may be permitted to suggest that I cannot consent to *sacrifice the Individual of my nature to the Social.* They are equally essential to my personality, and should be so developed and exercised as mutually to quicken and strengthen each other. Only thus can I be myself—true to the demands of the laws of humanity. All this, in my relations to the majority, I cannot but remember and apply. If, in any of the designs they subserve—in any of the arrangements they introduce—in any of the requisitions they urge, they bid me *fall foul of myself* by invading human rights and assailing human prerogatives—bid me thus inflict injuries, contract guilt, expose myself to remorse, shame, infamy, I am promptly, resolutely and steadfastly to resist the majority. I am to recognize no authority which may require me to commit suicide. However false the majority may be, I am, at whatever expense or hazard, to be true to human nature.

A fundamental law of my existence, as universal in its demands as it is immutable in its import, requires me to treat everything, with which I may be conversant, *characteristically*; man as man, right as right, meanness, selfishness, cruelty, *as they are*, and not otherwise. *I am to be truthful*—to adjust myself to truth in thought, affection, purpose—in speech and behavior. I am in no way, for no purpose, under no pressure to regard a man as a chattel—however he may be described and disposed of by bad men in high places; no matter where he may be, whether in Virginia or Kansas—in a State or a Territory. I am never to lend my countenance and support to a system of arrangements and influences which grow out of, and are adjusted to, selfishness and inhumanity, wherever any such system may be introduced, and whatever name it may bear. It is never to be allowed a place among my thoughts as entitled to the name and honors due to Civil Government. Never. I am never to acknowledge any name as a ruler, who is not distinguished for self-control, philanthropy, wisdom and magnanimity; who is not eminently a man among his fellows. Him I am always gratefully to recognize as a ruler, who is regal in his aims and exertions, wherever and however I may approach his presence, in whatever estimation he may be held by the majority. How can I, by any voluntary movement—by wielding the elective franchise, for instance—identify myself with a combination which, while it affects to be a government, tramples on the authority of God and the rights of man? How can I respect him as a ruler, who is the slave of his own passions? How can I honor him as my representative, who, in the spirit he breathes, and the objects he pursues, stands over against me in irreconcilable hostility? Such suffocating and malignant falsehoods I may not utter. *I am evermore to be truthful.* To this primitive obligation I am reverently to bow, whatever factitious claims may be urged upon me.

Now, what in my political relations is demanded of me in common with my fellows—demanded expressly or virtually, directly or by implication? Why, that I should regard an extended and complicated combination, which I know to be a grim and malignant conspiracy, as a true government! That I should identify myself with it in inflicting deadly injuries, worse than wantonly, on millions of my innocent brothers and sisters—merely to gratify the swollen pride and putrid indolence of the wretches who have fastened upon these helpless, unoffending creatures, the hand of violence! That I should, with a devilish "alacrity," help hold the victims down, while the miscreants, who impudently and clamorously claim such privileges, may rob them, and rape them, and murder them! That I should, in every relation, give my countenance and support to the complicated system of force and cunning which opens the way for such monstrous results! That I should pray for its prosperity and perpetuity! That I should pervert and prostitute my rational powers in defending it from aggression and commending it to the general confidence! That of the candidates which disgracefully represent the parties severally pronouncing "*the sum of all villanies*" *the* CHILD OF LEGITIMATE LEGISLATION, I should select a Breckinridge, or a Douglas, or a Lincoln, or a Bell to preside over the national domain and destiny! That I should thus "play false" to my inmost convictions, assail everything significant and sacred in our common human nature, trample on my own birthright, forfeit self-respect, renounce God and his Christ, and plunge headlong into deep damnation! From such demands, I cannot but turn away with an indignant and emphatic, No! In the name of the high heaven, and the broad, green earth, *No!* NEVER! And every tempter who may urge me to yield to any such demand, I must dismiss with a prompt, unqualified, Apage, Satanas!

But do I not, by submitting to the exaction of taxes, as truly as by wielding the elective franchise, identify myself with what here bears the name of government? Certainly not. I regard myself, amidst the political arrangements and forces which prevail around me, as an *exile and a captive.* If stout bandits, armed with unearthly terrors, bid me *stop and deliver*, my watch and my purse in their harpy hands are no proof that I have identified myself with them in their murderous designs. I have "fallen into the hands of thieves"—am the victim of violence. If they bear me away to their den, I must submit to their demands in everything which does not require me to act upon their principles. I may not hold their aims—may not employ their methods—may not join them in pursuing the objects on which they are intent. By no means. To submit to the exactions of unbridled selfishness, armed to the teeth, is one thing; to render it countenance, sympathy, cooperation, is, most certainly and manifestly, quite another. The former, amidst my political relations, I may do; the latter, never.—How I meet my responsibilities in these circumstances, I hope to explain in my next paper. BERIAH GREEN.

HENRY WARD BEECHER, the papers inform us, took occasion, in his morning sermon last Sunday, to speak in fit terms of denunciation of the action of the Episcopal Convention in relation to Mr. Jay's slave trade resolutions, and to commend the course of Mr. Jay as eminently right and proper. While we rejoice that Mr. Beecher was on this occasion, faithful to the cause of Christ and of humanity, we cannot withhold an expression of our deep regret that he failed, one year ago, to speak with equal plainness of the disgraceful course of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions in rejecting the anti-slave trade memorial presented by Dr. Cheever, and in artfully dodging the whole question by referring it to the Prudential Committee, to take such action as in their judgment it might seem to demand. The tricksters who concocted this plan of evasion and put it through at an unexpected moment knew, of course, that the Prudential Committee, with characteristic *prudence*, would let the matter entirely alone. Mr. Beecher, so far from having been quick to see and prompt to rebuke this cowardly stratagem, stood forth only three months afterwards, as the champion of the Board, to persuade the members of his congregation that its course on the slavery question had been such as to entitle it to their Christian confidence and liberal contributions. The Episcopal Convention, disgraceful as was its course, is at least entitled to the merit of putting down Mr. Jay by a square and unequivocal vote, without setting up any false pretence to delude the public; but the American Board sought to evade its responsibility and cover its heartlessness by a species of chicane that would have disgraced a political cabal.

From our Boston Correspondent.

NO. CCLXXVI.

THE ARGUMENT.—The Correspondent is political and that only—He doth justice to the Belleverett party and its sagacity—And rejoiceth over its invention—He depreciateth the Democrats in the comparison—And exalteth their powers of deglutition and digestion—He also frameth their faith and hope—And telleth of their search for a Governor—And of the anonymous candidate they found—Also of their taste for their own funerals—He rebuketh Mr. Breckinridge and putteth the saddle on the right horse—He doth equal justice to the Republicans—And to their candidate—Also the Vigilance Committee of New York in the matter of the Prince of Wales—But seeth not the need of one in Boston, etc, etc., etc

BOSTON, Oct. 1, 1860.

I HOPE you and your readers like politics, for I am not likely to find anything else to talk about this week. But of course you do, and they too, or you would be no true editor and they no true-born Yankees. Politics is the *pabulum* on which the infant Yankee is brought up—or *raised*, as they say at the South. To be sure, I don't know much about them; but that's no matter, or what would become of the whole race of *quidnuncs*, the breath in whose nostrils is the news of the day and the probabilities of the Election? And I suppose I know as much as anybody, unless, indeed, it be the Belleverett men, who know a great deal more than anybody else, in fact, more than can be known, which they may well do, as they see what is not to be seen. They know, for example, that Lincoln is going to be defeated, and they believe that by some miracle of politics, wrought probably by the relics of some of the dead saints, they expect to come to life again for the preservation of the honor and the salvation of the country; that either Bell or Everett will predominate over the country for the next four years, by the grace either of the House of Representatives or of the Senate. They are of that sect of true believers who believe "guid impossibile est," *because* the thing is impossible. I am afraid that they have relaxed in their resolution to elect their candidates directly by the Electoral College, in which they were set at first, so set that, as Hosea Biglow says, "a meetin-us isn't sotter"! Still, I trust that a remnant of these confessors may yet survive.

Indeed, we have to bless our stars for the invention of the Belleverett party, as the only diverting thing the campaign has afforded us. I don't know what we should have done without them. There is no fun to be got out of our Democratic brethren. There is no nonsense about them. A little solid lying occasionally; but worthy of the description of light and amusing fiction. They don't wish Massachusetts or New England to go for the Democratic candidates. They wish to have them elected, of course, for if not the pap-spoon would be transferred from their mouths to those of more callow political infants than they. But they have as many competitors for the offices in the gift of Washington as they can manage now, and their daily prayer is that a political Pentecost may be averted and not hastened They desire no Democratic Revival in their Churches and look upon a chance convert in the light of a hungry nuisance. Of course, there is no fun in their swaggerings and boastings and exhortations, for they notoriously mean nothing at all, and are only meant to keep up appearances. But the Belleverett men really believe what is told them, whether the tellers do or not—which I rather think they *do*. It is nothing but the Old Whig party newly christened; and the gullibility of an Old Whig, as I have often had occasion to tell you, is unfathomable. There is nothing that sticks in their throat, from gnats to camels. Their powers of deglutition are enormous, and as for digestion, an ostrich is a dyspeptic animal alongside of them. They did believe Mr. Webster was going to be nominated in 1852, and they would believe that he was going to be elected in 1860, if *The Courier* would only be at the pains to tell them so.

They received rather a damper in the result of the Maine election, to be sure. *The Courier* had all along talked as if it believed that its party was to carry the State, and the rank and file took it for granted, of course. It was full of shrieking exhortations to the voters there, up to the last moment, to come up to the help of the Union against the mighty. *The Post*, to be sure, talked in the same sort of strain; but, then, everybody knew that it knew better, while *The Courier* and its disciples actually believed the following tale which the hussey Hebe was hoaxing them with. I had the curiosity to see what these two authentic organs would say the morning after the news of the election had come to hand. In its column of items, *The Post* had this line, "only this and nothing more," "For news of the Maine election, see Telegraphic column"! And all that *The Courier* had to say for itself was, when its promised majority had shrunk to 1,285 votes, "Maine seems to have gone hopelessly Republican. See telegraphic column!" I should think it had, indeed. If the rank and file of the party were not struck with a judicial blindness, one would think that the way in which their Governorship went a begging might have opened their eyes. It was hard to find a confessor willing to accept that Crown of Martyrdom. And at last they had to take the Dark Lantern of the Know Nothings to mouse about after the honest man who would stand that sort of thing. And with great pains they hit upon Mr. Amos A. Lawrence, a very worthy and wealthy gentleman, but of no particular consequence any way. Of how much consequence he is esteemed may be judged of by the fact that at the meeting held in the Music Hall to ratify the State nominations, his name was not so much as mentioned! No one would have known, from anything said there, what the name of the candidate in whose glory the meeting was, might be.

They do have, though, an odd taste for ringing their own knell and walking in procession at their own funeral, which they do with the gravity of Lord Timothy Dexter, the only other party I ever heard of that was addicted to this posthumous amusement. I suppose, from the fling which Mr. Breckinridge gave them, (which was rather ungrateful, considering how ready they are to help him or anybody that has no suspicion of anti-slavery) about their having for their symbol a Bell with a tongue as long and a head as empty as their own, that this emblem of their emptiness and voidness is common all over the country wherever Bell and Everett have a name to live, being dead. This sarcasm, however *apropos*, was not original with the Vice-President, who wishes to be rid of his Vice. I remember it as long as I remember anything; the story in which it was set was on this wise. Sometime about the beginning of this century and along the close of the last flourished the Scotch Earl of Kellie, who was a friend and boon companion of the late Religious King of England, George IV., when he was the roystering Prince of Wales. Lord Kellie was a noted three-bottle man in those days, when three bottles was moderation, and was a favorite presiding officer on crowned occasions. On these occasions he was fond of exerting his prerogative as *rex vine*, and enforcing the laws of his realm of tipsihead on all and singular. Once he called upon a quiet, sober-sided gentleman, for a toast, or in default thereof, for a song, a story, or a bumper of salt and water. After vainly endeavoring to evade this tyranny and finding it impossible, he rose and said: "My Lord, since I must make my choice among these unpleasantnesses, I will tell you a story. Once upon a time a thief hid himself in a church for the purpose of robbing it of its plate. Having waited till after dark and loaded himself with his booty, he found that his only way of escape was to let himself down by the bell-rope. This he did, but, ringing the bell in the process, the crowd collected and seized and secured him. The unlucky adventurer," concluded the story-teller, "finding himself in custody, looked up at the bell and apostrophized it, *as I now address your lordship*, 'had it not been for your long tongue and your empty head, I should have made my escape.'"

The fact is, these deluded gentlemen resemble, in a small way, the Bourbons and other exiled potentates. They governed the State for so many years that they really think that they held their power by divine right, and that the revolution by which they were turned out years ago was an accident, a mistake which the people are longing to put right, and that they have only to show themselves to be hailed as the deliverers of their country. It is not likely they ever can be undeceived, though they will have a lesson this year which might teach them something, were they capable of instruction. The Republicans afford no picturesque points for description, any more than a country in time of peace and prosperity does for history. Whatever uncertainty may rest upon the prospects of the party elsewhere, there can be no question of its carrying this State by a very great majority. The opposition is just enough to make the Republicans rally their forces and make a larger demonstration. The only loss they are threatened with is in the Worcester district, where Mr. Eli Thayer, the present Republicano-Douglas member, runs on his own hook, with all the elements of opposition to help him. Everywhere else the Republicans are as sure as certainty of carrying everything before them. It is certainly a great step in advance of their past positions that they have set up a man of so pronounced anti-slavery opinions as Mr. Andrew as their candidate. The worst thing that has been said of him is, that he belongs to us. This is, of course, a lie. I don't recollect that he ever ran with our machine; he certainly was never a member of our company. But we can't help thinking well of him for the ready hand he has always been prompt to hold out whenever there was any anti-slavery professional work to be done. It would not do to say too much in his favor, though I imagine that it wouldn't hurt him much even if Garrison should put his name at the head of *The Liberator*. His success is past a peradventure.

I told you you must put up with politics this time, and probably you will have to the next time, too. Nothing continues to happen, in the most obstinate manner. We shall have the Prince of Wales by and bye, but then you will have taken the gloss off of him before we get him. I suppose you would like to keep him to yourselves as you did the Japanese and the Great Eastern. But he is a well-informed young man, and knows the relative value of places better than those owlish barbarians, and the bungling owners of the Big Ship. I see that we have imitated your example in one thing, and that is in the assumption of the whole thing by a self-constituted Committee. Poor Mr. Everett is the Chairman, and I imagine he will wish himself President of the United States—much as he shudders at that idea—before he is done with this invidious office. I see no occasion whatever for this arrangement. With you it was a necessity. Your City Government made a Vigilance Committee inevitable. It was a clear case for a revolution. A Provisional Government was demanded to save the first Young Gentleman of Europe from the hands of your Booles and Van Tines. But here there is no necessity of the kind. Our City Government is made up of respectable men, quite as competent to the task of doing the honors of the city as the gentlemen who have taken it out of their hands. But if the Mayor and Alderman are content, I am sure I am. D. Y.

Our European Correspondence.

LETTERS FROM PARIS....No. XXII.

PARIS, September 14, 1860.

I FIND in a recent number of the *Revue des Demy Mondes*, an article by M. Jules Duval, on the French colonies in the West Indies, which has much interest in showing what have been the effects of emancipation in those islands. M. Duval describes the negroes of Guadaloupe and of Martinique as strong and agile, good-natured, easily influenced by good treatment and kindness. They are very jealous of their new rights of exercising all trades, of acquiring and cultivating little pieces of land, of settling together in small, isolated villages, where religious authority takes the place of a severe administration. The other inhabitants are very discontented with this sort of immigration in the interior, but their attacks are generally unjust; official documents show, among the emancipated people, a number of marriages and legitimate births which, in the times of slavery, would have appeared fabulous, since all the advocates of the institution had always justified it by this singular argument—the horror of the negro for the institution of marriage. In 1856, the last year of the Census, there had been in Martinique, among the newly freed negroes, 637 marriages, 749 legitimate births; in Guadaloupe, 832 marriages and 767 legitimate births. The institution of the family brings with itself all other economical and moral improvements, with children to feed and educate. Under the *case* [or cabin], covered with leaves as in the wooden habitations, best come paternal love, activity, order and economy. The proprietors may deplore the difficulty of procuring labor for their manufactures; they have as much right to it (but not more) as the proprietors who, in France, deplore the emigration of the country people to the great towns.

Between the negroes and the white people are the mulattoes. M. Duval enters into very curious historical researches about that class, and shows that the antipathy towards it is not natural, but has been inspired by political reasons. Till 1674, the children followed the lot of their parents, and were free when their father was a free man. Ten years after, Louis XIV., who was so tender of his illegitimate children, doomed to slavery the children born of a negress and a white man. Under Louis XV., all marriage between the white and the colored people was forbidden, because "the white man and the mulatto might have joined against the metropolitan authority, and, by such an alliance, the colony might have freed itself from the authority of the king." In 1802, the First Consul reëstablished slavery and the slave trade, abolished during the Revolution; the Emperor maintained all the laws whose object was to create a division of classes—a bad policy, inspired by egotistical reasons, opposed to the influence of nature, unfavorable to the fusion of races and to sociability. An artificial hatred has been created, which must disappear by degrees, under the influence of natural forces which are no longer counterbalanced by the colonial policy.

Examining the actual state of the culture in the colonies, M. Duval shows that free labor, under the stimulus of emancipation, has produced better results than slave labor. In 1849, the last year of the slave system, our two colonies exported 36 millions of kilogrammes of sugar (official number); in 1859 the exportation had attained 56 millions; in a few years, and with the new machinery, it is expected it will come to 100 millions, and be also tripled. M. Duval acknowledges, nevertheless, that there is a tendency among the negroes to abandon the sugar plantations. The best among them make themselves proprietors, and settle in isolated villages. The proprietors invoke immigration as the only way of obtaining labor in sufficient quantity. Since a few years, the colonies import laborers. Three companies have been formed. Régis & Co. import laborers from the occidental coast of Africa (this firm is well known by the affair of the Charles and George); Gastel, Assier, Malavoin & Co., import Chinamen; in India there is a third company. The Africans are preferred, as being the strongest and the best fitted for the climate. The Indians are obedient, but delicate and indolent. From 1856 to 1859, twenty-four ships have brought 12,640 Indians, with an average mortality of 2.75 per cent., which is inferior to the mortality in the English ships engaged in the same trade. The Chinese, more recently imported, are the least numerous; they have the reputation of being laborious, very difficult to manage, very touchy, very unwilling to mix with the other races. M. Duval does not consider immigration as the proper remedy for the colonies. It maintains three or four races in a state of opposition and antipathy, instead of preparing a fusion, which is the only desirable object; it injures the interests of the negroes, by exciting rivalry; it is very expensive to the planters and to the colony, because the whole salary of the laborers leaves the islands; it produces a constant interference of the administrative authorities with the smallest details of labor; finally, the immigration system is accompanied by violence and fraud, which has been many times proved in Africa and in China.

The Italian question is again reopened. After the triumphant conquest of the two Sicilies by Garibaldi, Cavour, anxious to keep the direction of the Italian affairs in his own hands, so as not to be overrun by the Mazzinists, has decided upon a bold step; he has sent to the Pope an order to dissolve his army, commanded by Lamoricière, and the Piedmontese army has entered the Roman States, without any provocation on the part of the Pope. This, you may depend upon it, has been done with the tacit approval of the French Emperor; indeed, I should not wonder if he saw in a new war the only way of disentangling his policy from the many difficulties which surround him. In making war again for Italy, he may hope not to have England against him; and as for Germany, he is sure he must have war with it, sooner or later. From one end of Germany to the other, the hatred of the French ruler has pervaded all hearts. It is a movement like the movement of 1813. There can be no peace for Europe with a despotic power in France, obliging her to take up with glory and conquest as a compensation for liberty. The future looks very dark; we feel as if we were being carried away on the wing of destiny, without being able to stop or direct ourselves. To you in America, witnessing these events from a distance, how confused and strange they must look. The destroyer of liberty in his own country, liberating Italy; Lamoricière, the republican friend of Cavaignac, making himself a soldier of the Pope, in order to put an obstacle in the way of his imperial enemy; England encouraging and supporting Italy, and at the same time making, against Italy's ally, the most formidable preparations for war. This Gordian knot can only be cut by the sword. It is a great misfortune for Italy that her destinies should have been tied to those of a man who has inspired all the nations of Europe with such deep sentiments of distrust, and that her first victories should have been concomitant with the first aggrandizement of France, and the first triumph of a policy where violence is mixed with fraud, and which has, for object, the ultimate subjection of all Europe to the despotic rule of a military monarchy.

One sign of the times: the city of Paris has completed enormous public works since ten years, boulevards, streets, squares, etc.; but, as nothing comes out of nothing, the debt has been much increased. Paris has issued, a fortnight ago, a new loan of 140 millions of francs (a loan large enough for a kingdom) for new works. It was offered to the public at large, but only fifty millions have been subscribed. People begin to feel alarmed at this extravagant expenditure, which may have very agreeable results for the New York traveller, who admires the beauty of Paris, and thinks all is for the best in this best possible empire, but which imposes a very heavy burden on the tax-payer, and puts a duty on all the necessaries of life. "Paris Uninhabitable," is the title of a recent pamphlet, and it will really be so very soon for people of moderate means.

THE WESTERN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

SALEM, Ohio, Sept. 24, 1860.

To the Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

THE Western Anti-Slavery Society is now in session. Yesterday (Sunday) was a great day in its history. The crowded auditory, the uncompromising character of the resolutions, the earnestness of Mr. Foster, the eloquence of Douglass, and, indeed, the deep-toned sincerity which characterized the proceedings of the whole day, all conspired to make the occasion one long to be remembered.

One of the most thrilling, as well as important, scenes of the day was the reading of the Annual Report, by Mrs. JANE ELIZABETH JONES. Many of its passages were surpassingly eloquent, dissolving many a sturdy son of the prairies in tears. The tribute paid to the Hero of Harper's Ferry will be remembered longer than the eulogies upon Washington, and deserves a higher place in the archives of heroic history. I trust you will be able to give it a place in the columns of THE STANDARD. It does great honor to anti-slavery literature, on the one hand, and is a most important historic page on the other.

But I will not anticipate the official report of proceedings, nor trespass on your columns further to-day. The zeal and interest in the raising of funds, and the circulation of the brave little *Bugle*, were in some degree worthy the enterprise and the occasion. Y.

The above letter was probably intended to reach us in time for publication last week, but it did not arrive before our paper went to press. We now have before us *The Bugle* of the 29th ult., containing the official record of proceedings. Proof-slips of the Annual Report, with a copy of the Society's resolution requesting us to publish the same, came to hand several days since, but the preoccupation of our columns compels us to defer it, together with the resolutions adopted by the Society, till next week.

The Society convened at the Town Hall, in Salem, on Saturday, the 22d ult. Marius R. Robinson, President, took the chair and made an admirable introductory address, describing and justifying the uncompromising attitude of Abolitionists in respect to the political parties and religious sects of the day, and exhorting the friends of the cause to fidelity and perseverance. James Barnaby was appointed to report such of the speeches made during the meeting as it might be desirable to publish; and the following Committees were announced:

Business Committee.—Parker Pillsbury, Lydia Irish, J. Elizabeth Jones, Wm. F. Parker, Wm. Holliday, Abram Brooke, and Wm. Watson.

Nominating Committee.—Reuben Erwin, John Clemmer, John M. Holmes, Fanny Dean, and Sarah N. McMillan.

Finance and Bugle Committee.—Abby Kelley Foster, Josephine S. Griffing, with power to add to their number.

The meeting continued, with deep interest, for three days. The principal speakers were Parker Pillsbury, Abby Kelley Foster and H. Ford Douglass. *The Bugle* says: "Mr. Pillsbury and Mrs. Foster were warmly greeted as old acquaintances; and Mr. Douglass, who came as a stranger, made a very favorable impression by his eloquence, his genial spirit, and suavity of manners." The proceedings were enlivened by appropriate singing. The Treasurer's report exhibited, receipts $2,441.31; expenditures $2,215.57; balance on hand, $225.64. The Committee on Finance and *The Bugle* obtained cash donations for the treasury, amounting to $98; pledges, to be paid within six months, amounting to $128,40; new subscribers to the paper, 24; collected on old subscriptions, $118. Seven women pledged themselves to obtain at least five subscribers to *The Bugle* within one month, or, failing in this, to pay the subscription price and dispose of the papers as they should see fit. Eight men made similar pledges, varying somewhat in number and conditions; and Abby K. Foster pledged herself to obtain 50 subscribers in three months. Whole number of new subscribers pledged, 170.

The officers elected for the ensuing year are: MARIUS R. ROBINSON, President; Benjamin Bown, Wm. F. Parker, J. Ridgeway Haines, Thomas Heighton, Martha J. Tilden, Thomas Chandler, Caleb Greene, Wm. Hern, Thomas Donaldson, Sarah Otis Earnst, J. G. Price, Maria C. K. Arter, Amos Brosius, Carver Tomlinson, Marsena Miller, Lot Holmes, Vice-Presidents; Joel McMillan, Treasurer; J. Elizabeth Jones, Corresponding Secretary; Benjamin S. Jones, Recording Secretary; Lewis Morgan, Abraham Brooke, R. S. Baird, Isaac Trescott, John Gordon, Sarah N. McMillan, James Barnaby, Counsellors.

THE POLITICAL TEXT-BOOK FOR 1860.—A second edition of this work (prepared by Horace Greeley and J. F. Cleveland) having been called for, the compilers have increased its value by the addition of new matter in the form of an appendix. The matter referred to embraces the famous Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions of 1798–9; further extracts from the speeches of S. A. Douglas, illustrating his views of slavery; an epitome of the Dred Scott decision, and a report of the action of Congress on the question of disapproving and declaring null and void the Territorial laws of New Mexico establishing and protecting slavery.

APPEAL FOR AID.—Rev. Daniel Foster, of Centralia, Nemeha Co., Kansas, has come East to solicit aid for an interesting colony in that place, the people having been reduced by the terrible drouth of the past season to the alternative of seeking assistance or abandoning their homes. We have not room for particulars, but do not hesitate to commend Mr. Foster to the confidence of such as may be able to afford the aid he seeks. Donations may be sent to Oliver Johnson, Anti-Slavery Office, New York.

ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE AND BOOK DEPOSITORY.

AN office, for the sale of Anti-Slavery, Temperance, Woman's Rights, Anti-Capital Punishment, Peace, Spiritual and other publications, has been established at No. 15 Steuben street, Albany, N. Y., near the Delavan House. A general assortment of stationery will be kept on hand for sale on the most favorable terms. Subscriptions for *The Liberator*, NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, *Anti-Slavery Bugle* (Ohio), *London Anti-Slavery Advocate* and *Herald of Progress*, will be received.

Contributions are solicited to aid in printing and circulating Petitions, sustaining Lectures, publishing Tracts for gratuitous distribution, etc., etc.

Donations, Orders for Books and Tracts, and communications relative to anti-slavery and other reform meetings in different parts of the State should be addressed to the general agent,

LYDIA MOTT, Albany, N. Y.

Committee.

S. J. May,	M. C. Wright,	A. M. Powell,
P. H. Jones,	G. E. Baker,	L. Mott.
S. B. Anthony,	E. C. Stanton,	

THE TWENTY-SEVENTH National Anti-Slavery Subscription-Anniversary.

JANUARY, 1861.

WHEN the claim for Universal Liberty was first made in our country, the best part of a lifetime ago, the work lay wholly in futurity. The idea and the principles of Human Rights were to be replanted, the justice and necessity of their cause as against slavery to be proved, the prevailing apathy to be broken, the public mind to be awakened and enkindled, the insufficiency of a Church and State controlled by slavery to compass freedom to be demonstrated, the retrogression of the land towards barbarism under their sway to be made manifest, and freedom of speech, of the press, and of a new specific association to be claimed and exercised as the only sufficient instrumentalities of progress.

This is the initiatory work that has been done, and by it abundant opportunities of direct action have been rendered practicable. The WORK ITSELF, in a thousand shapes, now lies before us, whose privilege it has been to make ready for it. The despotism is driven into open day. To meet it, requires devotion, industry, and the sacred fire of a true enthusiasm. It requires energy, coöperation and the discipline of self-control. It requires generous contributions of money. We trust that all these indispensable requisites are now, as ever, ready.

We earnestly and cordially entreat all who love our native land in sincerity, whether Europeans or Americans, to unite with us more numerously and more generously than ever to meet the demands of a period of crises unparalleled in the history of our country—new, indeed, in the history of the world. For when before has it ever happened that Freedom has been sought from among a dominant people for a down-trodden one, on so grand a scale as this? We ask aid of Europeans, while we bid them observe that their freedom makes progress only in exact proportion as our slavery is brought into discredit. We ask aid of Americans; for where is the American to whom this cause of ours is not the supreme interest of the present hour as affording the only hope of Futurity? The work before us is ever that primary one contemplated by no other existing body, political or religious: the work that Church and Government are always tempted by the necessities of their position as such to neglect, adjourn, suppress. And the stronger the desire of their members to promote the cause, the stronger the temptation, being so placed, to temporise and to compromise.

To all these we confidently appeal for aid in the work they can neither do, nor do without.

We cordially invite all who love Liberty the world over, to meet us at the Music Hall, Boston, in the month of January next, in person or by letter, uniting their sympathies and contributions with ours in the great work of the time—the peaceful extinction of American slavery.

MARIA WESTON CHAPMAN,	LYDIA D. PARKER,
MARY MAY,	ELIZA F. EDDY,
LOUISA LORING,	SARAH P. REMOND,
L. MARIA CH

Miscellaneous Department.

FOR THE ANTI SLAVERY STANDARD.

THE WINDS OF AUTUMN.

Hear ye the Autumn winds,
As they're sweeping o'er the main;
The wild and mournful wailing of the winds,
As they plough up the billows,
And through the masts strain,
And leave the ship far, far behind.

Hear ye the Autumn winds,
As they're sweeping through the trees,
And dashing down the broad mountain's side;
That come with the harvests,
And tear off the leaves,
And scatter them abroad, far and wide.

They sigh through the forests,
And they moan o'er the plain,
And up the dreary valley they roar—
As sad and weary spirits
Of the past, come again
To visit the loved scenes of yore.

The loud and fitful gusts
Pass mournfully on,
And the clouds sweep darkly o'er the sky,
While the tall forest trees
Bend low to the storm,
As the strong rushing wind passes by.

How the giant limbs
Of the stately old oak,
That has stood for a hundred long years,
Now tremble and creak
'Neath the storm's bold stroke,
When the tempest in its fury draws near.

Now the storm grows louder,
And wilder sweeps the blast,
As the winds from the North fiercer blow,
Till the wild, weird spirits
Of the long-forgotten past
Seem to wander in the pines here below.

And trooping, trooping down
In their silent, ghostly bands,
And whispering plaintive tales of the dead,
Tramping, tramping on
To the dim and shadowy lands
Where they keep their silent watch overhead.

The grim and dusky warriors,
From the spirit-land afar,
Rushing through the forest, as of yore,
They gather to the council
To talk of sudden war,
Or wander on the ocean's stormy shore.

Now low and solemn dirges,
Now wild and plaintive strains,
And the footsteps, swiftly tramping on the air,
As the tempest sweeps the forest
And rushes down the plain,
Come, swelling from the tree-tops everywhere.

'Tis the wail of the departed,
Of the warriors and the braves,
Of the swarthy, painted Indian and his foe,
Of the sachems and the chieftains,
Full of dignity, and grave,
Of the tribes that roamed the forests years ago.

They are coming from the meadows,
From the forests where they died,
From the valleys and the woodlands all around,
From the prairies and the rivers,
From the distant mountain's side;
And they're looking for the happy hunting-ground.

They are telling their sad story,
How they fought and how they bled,
How they loved their native land as others do,
How they built their wigwams on it,
How they planted corn for bread,
How the dark-eyed, dusky maids they used to woo.

Then the white man came among them,
Took their lands and ate their corn,
Built him wigwams on the dry land by the sea,
Drove the Indian to the westward,
To the setting of the sun;
From the land of his forefathers made him flee.

So the winds are ever saying,
When the Autumn tempest lowers,
When the oak tree and the maple shed their leaves,
When the Frost King in his chariot
Boldly tramples on the flowers,
And the dreary storm is sighing in the trees.

Brookline, Mass., Sept. 22, 1860. J. H. M.

A WORD FOR THE GOVERNOR'S EARS.

PETER TITELMANN RAISED FROM THE DEAD.

Will His Excellency Governor Morgan, of the State of New York, have the goodness to listen while we drop a word into his ears? There is a story which needs telling, and which, we hope, when it is told, will make them tingle.

The Police Gazette—a journal which is in the interest of everybody else rather than of rogues, and which has never been charged with too much humanity toward State prisoners—contained in a recent issue an article which is understood to have been from the pen of Mr. Matsell, Chief of Police for many years in New York, in which he describes some of the punishments inflicted upon convicts at Sing Sing in terms fitted to make the reader shudder at the recital. The key-note of the testimony from this old punisher of offenders is in these words:

"*The tortures of Sing Sing exceed by far the punishment of the prisons of Naples, or of any other country in the world.*"

He then gives a long and painful description of these cruelties, from which only a few passages will be here quoted—as follows:

THE TERRORS OF THE WATER-SHOWER.

"We were present while the shower-bath was inflicted on four of the prisoners. The first stripped and fastened in the box, was a pale, consumptive-looking creature. After being fixed on the stool, the water was allowed to drop on his naked person for a few minutes, which chilled him all over, and the knees shook and trembled, the teeth chattered together, and the eye-balls protruded from their sockets with a painful, despairing glare. Down came the water in volumes upon the head, over the face and the body, filling the box till it reached the nostrils, and in vain was the head shaken from side to side, to get air without water, for no sooner was the mouth opened than the throat filled, and when the victim was evidently suffocating, the bath was stopped. Three or four minutes were given him to spit up the water imbibed and recover, when down came the water again, and the same scene was reënacted for a quarter of an hour, which to him must have been an eternity, in which he bore the sufferings of a hundred strangulations. The others were similarly punished, and when lifted out of the bath were partly insensible, unable to stand, and as soon as full recollection returned, a flood of tears relieved them.

"'And what were they punished for? Aye, that is the question; and it was hard work to find it out, everybody's tongue was tied; the answer was insolence; further than that none would speak. But the man under the shower-bath let the secret out; they were sick—they were poor—which is an offence all the world over; they applied to the physician for relief for a pain in the chest—they were denied a ticket of sickness, they could not complete their work, and dying men were shower-bathed because they could not accomplish impossibilities."

The prisoner mentioned in the following portion of this narrative is the man who headed the late insurrection a few weeks ago. The writer says:

"Then came

TOM KELLY.

His was no ordinary case. Half-a-dozen keepers surrounded his cell when he came out of it, and followed him to the shower-bath. Half-a-dozen men, armed to the teeth, conducted him to the scene of his sufferings, where were waiting half-a-dozen more to conquer him, should he make the slightest demonstration of resistance.

"Kelly came into the room pale and livid. The lips were compressed, the eyes sunken and half closed, and the cheek bones projected more prominently than in ordinary cases, from the compression of his jaws.

"'Take off your clothes, sir!' said the keeper.

"The mandate was obeyed without a reply, and he stripped himself naked and entered the bath. A convict, who stood by, fixed his feet in the stocks, his hands in the armlets, and his head under the bath. As soon as he was placed under it, while no one was looking, he shook his head as much as to say, 'I've got to suffer.' The water was allowed to trickle down his face and warm body for a few minutes before the bath fell upon his head. At length it fell. Tom bore it well; not a shiver of the legs, not a muscular movement of the hands or fingers, not a single cry of distress, although he was actually being drowned for about five minutes.

"'You bear it well, Tom,' said one of the keepers, after the first five minutes had elapsed, and time had been given him to recuperate.

"'It's awful,' was Tom's reply; 'but I can't ask for mercy.'

"Down came the water again, and for five minutes longer the gurgling sounds of a strangulated man were audible, and when he was exhausted, the cord was let up and the water stopped. A few minutes of release was granted, and down came the water again, and the scene was more terrible than the worst execution we had ever witnessed. At length, congestion of the brain was threatened, * * * and a 'hiss' from the physician brought the third scene to a close. Several minutes were allowed the unfortunate man to recover, but the punishment was too terrible to witness to the end, and we left. He had been fifteen minutes under the shower, but had twenty-five minutes more of the same suffering to endure when we left; and for the next forty days the same sort of punishment will be meted out to him, unless he dies under the hands of the keeper.

"It was an awful spectacle to witness this man under the bath. Every muscle contracted, and became corded; sometimes the hands would become convulsed, and every nerve strained, when there would follow a relaxation. Then the water would cease to pour, and then would appear the sufferings of the culprit; the retching, the vomiting, and * * * Hanging is nothing to the torture of the shower-bath. The man subjected to the bath for half an hour suffers ten times the amount of pain caused by strangulation, for the simple reason that just as consciousness is about leaving, and when he would be happy to die, he is brought back to a full realization of his sufferings."

Now, we respectfully remind the Governor of New York and the State Prison Inspectors, that the age of the Spanish Inquisition is commonly supposed to have passed away, and that the cruelties of the rack, the pincers, the thumbscrew and the vice, are commonly supposed to have passed away with it. To what Christian end, therefore, are they revived in this State Prison by the introduction of a new torture, equally ingenious and equally terrible with the old?

This same mode of punishment, inflicted on a negro in the Auburn Prison, *put him to death*. The fall of water on the bare skull—as is well known not only to those who suffer it, but to those who inflict it—stuns the brain, quenches the nervous energy, destroys the power of the will over the muscles, produces emasculation, fever, and an inevitable tendency to wildness of mind, resulting often in partial and sometimes complete insanity. It is a greater barbarity than the use of the scalping-knife among Indians. It reduces a man to within one gasp of death, and only brings him back to life after he has wished and tried to die. The Juggernaut itself is less cruel, because, though it tortures its victims, it does not refuse to slay them. The Cat-o'-nine was long since abolished from our Navy, and from our State Prisons, in obedience to a public sentiment which decried it as brutal. But here, substituted in its place, hid in a small dark closet, is an instrument which, at the pull of a string, will more nearly kill a man in three minutes than to flog at a whipping-post for an hour. Forty days under this stunning rain—in which every drop falls like a millstone—in which the flood of water rising above the lips and nostrils strangulates the victim with successive drownings, from which he is successively rescued only to be drowned again—in which the passing minutes seem lengthened into a lifetime—in which the mortal agony to the sufferer is beyond the power of any words to describe—if any device of cruelty were ever needed to be invented for racking and ruining the body and mind of a strong man without shedding his blood, could anything more be asked for than this? We know of a stout, muscular, hardy man—a State Prisoner—confined, we will not mention in what prison—who went into the shower-bath, carrying with him in his great frame the strength of a giant, who, after his prostration by the shower, was carried exhausted to his bed, where paralysis crept into his limbs, and he has never walked a step since!

Peter Titelmann, the Inquisitor of the Netherlands—with whose name mothers hushed their children in the night—whose cruelty was so great that it has gone unchronicled for lack of a fit word to name it—whose bones have been rotting for three Christian centuries since William the Silent—has at length been raised from the dead, and now, with his hands full of new devices of torture, unknown of old, has become again, worse than before, the arch-tormentor of human bodies and souls.

In the case of Tom Kelly, what was the provocation to the punishers, and what their justification for the punishment? Was not Tom Kelly a bad man? Yes! But bad men, however bad, are not to be treated worse than brutes. Did he not merit unusual punishment? Grant that he did. His offence was grave; he was the leader of a revolt; he broke away from the prison with a small company of followers, boarded a sloop, fought fearfully with the captain and a keeper, and wounded them both with a knife-blade before the revolt could be quelled. He committed no ordinary offense, and merited no ordinary punishment. But was there any warrant for resorting to a torture unknown even to Torquemada's list of cruelties to heretics? Were there none of Phillip II.'s chastisements that could have been borrowed, instead of this which is worse than all? Nay, in the name of mercy, were there not already enough instruments for vexing human flesh, known and used from time immemorial in the prison at Sing Sing, and tested—many a time and full well—by many a poor fellow's groans and tears?

We do not enter here a single step into the wide question as to what are the essential principles that should underlie a true system of prison discipline; whether humiliating and degrading punishments should be admitted or rejected; whether confinement and privation should suffice for insubordination, or whether there should be inflictions of bodily pain; we only say, leaving out of sight entirely the claims of a general milder system, that the advocates of a severe administration—even such as are in favor of sharp tortures to flesh and nerve, and who make no hesitation in saying, "The rascals deserve the Russian knout"—may nevertheless banish from the catalogue of State Prison cruelties the indescribable barbarity of Water-Shower, and have still remaining all the needed apparatus for a moderate Inquisition, which, sufficient for a dungeon in Naples, is certainly sufficient for the prison at Sing Sing.

Look there, good reader! What instruments had the keepers which, instead of this Drowning Bath, they might have used upon Tom Kelly? There was the Chain-and-Ball—an instrument for the ankles, and easily set tight enough to excite shooting pains of inflammation. There was the Crucifix, ready to stretch out a man's arms and hold them apart until he should faint from exhaustion. There was the Iron Crown—more uneasy than Charlemagne's—loading the neck and head with fifteen pounds of solid weight in iron, to be worn day and night, at the work-bench and on the pillow. There was the Rope-and-Pulley, for tying a man under the arms and hoisting him into the air, where he hangs until he is subdued. There was the Dark Cell, from which every ray of light is excluded, that the victim may be driven to crouch down in a corner and yield himself up to despair. There was the device of Bucking, which consists in binding a man's ankles and knees, binding his hands under his knees, and running a pole between the hands and the knees, each end of which is supported at the height of a barrel from the ground, and on which the man hangs, struggles, and swings, head downward, until the keeper is satisfied. There was also the process of Starvation, by which the worst of men may at any time be punished horribly enough, God knows! through the pangs of hunger and thirst.

All these aids and instruments were ready at hand, to execute any moderate or immoderate measure of vengeance upon Tom Kelly. Why did the keepers forget all these, and remember only that they had a device more barbarous than them all?

It is now high time that people, living outside of prison walls, should know something of what is going on inside. Tom Kelly's case is thrown upon the public, not for Tom Kelly's sake, but for humanity's. Criminals are human creatures notwithstanding their crimes. God's image may be hid very obscurely in a bad man's heart, but it is still there. For in the darkest nature—buried under the guiltiest passion, under the deadliest malice, under the rottenest vice—still remains some part of the man's immortal manhood—which can be hidden but can never be blotted out, which may never be seen of men, but is never forgotten of God. And because there is in every man's nature some element of God's, it becomes sacrilege to treat even the worst of men as anything worse than men. A prisoner, however bad, cannot be worse than the worst; while it is too sadly true that many a poor fellow who wears the Striped Jacket was never guilty of the crime for which he wears it.

"If he is guilty, you must mend him,
If he is innocent, defend him."—*Dean Swift.*

The State has a right to mete out to offenders a just penalty, but has no right to inflict upon them a cruel torture. Cruelty to men, to beasts, or to insects is despicable. If you slay an ox for food, he has a right to his death by a single blow. If you lift your hand against a fly that stings your cheek, you are to kill the little assassin at a single stroke; but if instead of ending its own miseries with yours, you pluck off its wings and let it go alive, you are to be pointed at for cruelty, and nicknamed a Nero. A majority of men are settled in their opinion as to the propriety of hanging criminals for certain crimes; executing quick punishment with a sheriff's rope; but the moral sentiment of all mankind revolts at the process of killing men by inches.

If Tom Kelly, before he became a State's prisoner, had not only stabbed but killed the captain of a sloop—and not in an unexpected fray, but in cold blood—he would have been arrested, tried, found guilty, and sentenced to be hung; but no jury or judge, sitting in any court in a civilized nation, would ever have thought of rendering a sentence for so prolonged, so unparalleled, so inhuman a cruelty to be inflicted upon any criminal under the sun. An assassin, a pirate, a highwayman may be decently executed; that is all. Even the old vengeance upon the dead body—drawing and quartering—has been done away. Nay, in this late and Christian century of the world, a criminal may stand on the edge of the scaffold—with the cowl ready to be drawn over his head, and the trap ready to be dropped under his feet—and yet his executioner durst not even superadd so small a cruelty as to scratch the culprit's flesh with a pin.

The immediate suffering, and the permanent injury, falling to the lot of Tom Kelly during this Forty Days' Flood, is greater than if he were to lose day by day a joint from a finger or toe, or to suffer a gradual clipping of half-inch pieces from his lips or ears. Men taken from the closet of this shower are not unfrequently so nearly dead that they need the most violent stimulus—like men rescued from drowning—to restore them to consciousness.

Nor is this all. The most disastrous of the effects of this mode of punishment are of such a character that a proper taste forbids their mention in a public print. But even with the worst left untold, what shall be said of tolerating in a public institution a torture to be inflicted upon a human being, which, in less time than it takes to tell the story, chills the naked body into an apparent corpse, beats the brain into senselessness, clenches the muscles into whip-cords, starts the eyes from their sockets, chokes the throat with the strangulations of drowning, and, by successive shock and shudder through the frame, drives the soul well-nigh to its last and final struggle of parting from the flesh?

We therefore take the liberty of dropping a word into the Governor's ears. The word is this: Let His Excellency remind the Legislature in his next message that as the old brutality of the Cat-o'-nine was years ago thought bad enough to be driven by law beyond every prison-wall in the Empire State, so now a still more cruel torture, too brutal to have any rightful place in a Christian age or State, is waiting for a similar perpetual banishment by a similar humane law. In the meantime—before the Legislature shall be able to put a stop to it finally and for ever—let His Excellency have ten minutes' conversation with the State Prison Inspectors, and then let the next mail bring down from Albany an order something to this effect:

"*To the Keeper of Sing Sing Prison. Lock up the little Chamber of Inquisition where these agonies are suffered—throw the key to the bottom of the Hudson River—and let the door be never opened again. By order of the Inspectors.*"

This is an earnest word for the Governor's ears. Is it worth his heeding or forgetting? We know that many words are spoken for the Governor to hear; words which pass in at one ear and pass out at the other; words of complainants who have grievances to redress; words of criminals who have pardons to implore; words of politicians asking appointments; words of lobby-men pushing their schemes; words of enemies coining their slanders; words of friends making their generous acclamations and renominations; words so many and so various, that he can neither hear all, nor answer half. But among so many words, some must be entitled to a hearing. What will he do with the word which we have dropped into his ears to-day?

THEODORE TILTON.

HONORS PAID TO JOHN BROWN IN FRANCE.

[We are glad to lay before our readers the following generous and hearty tribute to John Brown from the Freemasons of France—all the more magnanimous as he was not a member of the Order. This, and Victor Hugo's eloquent and touching appeals, show how keenly alive France is to the cause of Justice and Liberty the world over. The following extract is translated from the January number of the *Monde Maconnique* (Masonic World), Paris.]

John Brown's death has made almost as profound a sensation in Europe as on the other side of the Atlantic. England and France, who are no longer directly interested in the question of slavery, are still as deeply moved as at the time, not far back, when the slaves were not yet emancipated in the colonies of either of these two principal European nations, and when the interests of both, opposed to emancipation, made one fear the indefinite postponement of the triumph of reason and justice.

The death of John Brown is a last warning given to the United States; danger is at hand, and they should make haste to follow England who gave them birth, and France who gave them liberty, in the path where these have had the honor and courage to lead.

One will see by the letters quoted below, and taken from *La Presse*, the effect produced in America by the sentence and execution of John Brown and his companions. The effect is immense, far beyond what any one could have reasonably expected. In this conflict between transient and individual interests, and the eternal principles of human rights, it is needless to tell on which side are our sympathies. With those of all Freemasons, they have followed, to their last moments, John Brown and his four companions, Cook, Coppic, Green and Copeland; they are with the generous and freedom-loving North against the feudal and pro-slavery South.

Of all the words of our motto, Fraternity is the one most deeply engraven on the heart of every true Mason. In our view, John Brown is a martyr to Fraternity, and for this we should honor his memory. So thought the Lodge St. Vincent-de-Paul, and it was at their Solstitial Winter-feast, celebrated the 6th of January, that Monsieur Ulbach expressed the feelings of all the Masons there assembled, offering the following sentiment, in a speech which was interrupted, from time to time, by the unanimous applause of the audience:

Brothers: If our object in these assemblies were only pleasure, if this were merely a convivial meeting, I should refrain from offering the sentiment which I am about to propose. I would not insult a holy cause by naming it in the midst of decorous festivities or selfish enjoyment; nor would I sadden, by too grave words, hours devoted to joys so short and so fleeting. But we are seated at a banquet sacred as a sacrifice, and you are men of free thought whom serious subjects do not startle, and who, in celebrating with full goblets, with smiles and garlands of flowers, the feast of Life, do not forget the triumph of Death.

Let me, then, speak to you of death, and evoke here, in the midst of our clasped hands, of our hearts united in the bonds of brotherhood, mid the vows we utter and the hymns we chant, let us evoke that gibbet on which they have just hung an honest man, a martyr to *Equality* and *Fraternity*—John Brown!

Brothers, it is to the memory of John Brown that I drink this toast. I know all the reserve that is due here in regard to events which are not yet history; I know all the prudence of which Freemasonry has need, in order to avoid giving offence; but I know, also, what I owe my soul when a grand sight is shown it; I know what counsel, what encouragement, what fraternal aid we owe each other. I know that when a man dies anywhere in maintaining the principles of our Order, we ought to weep for him, but to weep as they weep who believe in the Future and in Justice! His is an example we ought to treasure, an encouragement we ought to take to ourselves. Yes, an encouragement. There is still, then, upon this old earth, already steeped in blood and tears, room for the inquisitor and for the gibbet? So much the better! The idea which they thus resist is very near its triumph. Alas! America hides chains in the folds of her banner, blue as the sky! Alas! when a man rises and says to the slaves, Children, awake! the slaves are silent and the masters rebel! What! this infamy—making martyrs of the apostles of brotherly love—can exist among a republican people in this our enlightened age! If God permits such a sight, it is not to discourage reason, but to give it the last warning.

That scaffold erected beyond the sea, whose shadow stretches even to us, America, with all her glory, cannot hide. It must stand as a protest till the last link that binds the slave is sunk in the ocean. It stands a constant appeal to all noble and earnest men. And, on our part, let us respond with an anathema and with plaudits, a curse on the impious murderers who tried to extinguish a divine flame in smothering a human soul; who thought to strangle God in hanging a man. Let us applaud the majesty of that sublime death, of that voluntary sacrifice; let us receive into the purest sanctuary of our thoughts, of our regrets, of our love, this just man who smiled in dying, and who gave his life to hasten, even by one day, the reign of Justice.

I had wished to describe to you the work and the death of John Brown; but it would need pages, and I have only time for a word. Besides, you have all read, brothers, the details of that austere, devoted life which fought bravely, and which sacrificed itself without shrinking, manifesting the brotherly love of Abel, even under the heel of Cain!

I will not interrupt with a long discourse this family festival; I wished only that a noble spirit, a hero's spirit, might come to join our circle of union, to speak to us of self-sacrifice and of virtue, and to give a deeper earnestness to the pledges we renew at each meeting. I wished to speak to freedom-loving men of a liberator fallen, not conquered. I wished, at this moment when hearts open most freely, when counsel is received with the least distrust, to ask you to meditate on thoughts like these I now offer.

The death of John Brown is a defiance, the last one, offered by barbarous prejudice to *Reason* and to *Fraternity*. The death of John Brown proves, once again, that, more than all other evils, slavery brings the irremediable misfortune of withering souls, and rendering them incapable of regretting liberty and wishing for deliverance. It does not only abase one man, it corrupts a generation. Behold! a crime against the present, it is also a crime against the future, and the most manifest outrage that could be done to Providence and to progress. The death of John Brown proves to us, finally, that it does not suffice to inscribe beautiful sentiments upon our walls, great principles upon our banners—to have sublime symbols—if the sentiments are not realized in action, if our banners are not borne in the front of justice, if we do not draw from our symbols a living, fruitful truth.

This is the lesson useful to all, particularly applicable to Freemasonry. You will pardon me for having introduced it on a festive occasion. The Egyptians caused a skeleton to be brought into their feasts to remind them of death. But, when we evoke this martyr, it is to think of life, of immortal life, which man changes, but which he cannot destroy; which continues for Brown as for all mankind; for the heart of this saint, this soldier of ideas, will throb in every bosom until the day when, his work accomplished, we can say, Behold! John Brown still lives! Death is only the prison of the just. He passes through it in order to reclothe himself with glory and immortality. Weep not for the man hung on that scaffold; he left only a body of clay to men who hated and persecuted him from low and earthly considerations. His spirit, which they have set free, breathes among us now; it will smile upon this our offering.

Brothers, I drink this toast:

To the memory of John Brown—the martyr to brotherly love; to the abolition of all slavery; to Fraternity, without which, liberty is only the consecration of force, and the despotism of material interests.

EPITAPH ON AN OLD MAID.

BY E. S.

Rest, gentle traveller, on life's toilsome way;
Pause here awhile; yet o'er this lifeless clay
No weeping, but a joyful tribute pay.

For this green nook, by sun and showers made warm,
Gives welcome rest to an o'er-wearied form,
Whose mortal life knew many a wintry storm.

Yet, ere the spirit gained a full release
From earth, she had attained that land of peace,
Where seldom clouds obscure, and tempests cease.

No chosen spot of ground she called her own;
She reaped no harvest in her spring-time sown;
Yet always in her path some flowers were strown.

No dear ones were her own peculiar care,
So was her bounty free as heaven's air;
For every claim she had enough to spare.

And loving more the heart to give than lend,
Though oft deceived in many a trusted friend,
She hoped, believed, and trusted to the end.

She had her joys; 'twas joy to live, to love,
To labor in the world with God above,
And tender hearts that ever near did move.

She had her griefs; but why recount them here—
The heart-sick loneliness, the on-looking fear,
The days of desolation, dark and drear—

Since every agony left peace behind,
And healing came on every stormy wind,
And with pure brightness every cloud was lined,

And every loss sublimed some low desire,
And every sorrow helped her to aspire,
Till waiting angels bade her go up higher?

Boston, Mass. —*Englishwoman's Journal.*

TREES.

At the Middlesex County Cattle Show, held at Concord, Mass., on Thursday, Sept. 20th, Mr. Henry D. Thoreau, the orator of the day, delivered an address on Trees, an abstract of which we are, through the author's kindness, enabled to lay before our readers. Mr. Thoreau said that he had often been asked if he could tell how it happened that when a pine wood was cut down an oak one sprang up, and *vice versa*. When a single tree, or a forest springs up where none of its kind were before, it comes from a seed. This is the only supposable way. It remains then only to show how the seed is transported from where it grew to where it is planted. This is done chiefly by the agency of the wind, water and animals. In all the pines a very thin membrane covers and surrounds the seed; this the wind takes hold of, and the seed is transported by its agency. We need not believe that pines spring from nothing, that there is a new act of creation—a belief entertained at this day by many persons. When you cut down oaks, a pine wood will not *at once* spring up, unless there are seed-bearing pines near enough for the seeds to be blown from them; but if pines are near, you will surely have them if your soil is suitable. As to the heavy seeds, such as nuts and acorns, which are not carried by the wind, the notion is still common, that when trees bearing them spring up where none of the kind were before, they have been spontaneously generated or have lain dormant in the soil for centuries, or been called into activity by some unusual heat. These theories cannot be correct. Every one knows how cherry stones are carried about by the birds, and no one is surprised to see a cherry tree growing far from every other of its kind. So with other seeds. But to consider particularly the manner in which acorns are transported and planted among pines. They must grow somewhere in the neighborhood; if there is no oak tree within ten miles and man does not carry the seeds, an oak wood will not spring up at once when pines are cut down. In this neighborhood, where oaks and pines are about equally dispersed, in the thickest pine woods may be found, at any time, many little oaks, birches, etc., sprung from seeds carried into the thicket by squirrels and other animals, but which are overshadowed and choked by the pines. The denser the evergreen wood, the more likely it is to be resorted to and planted by the squirrels. The planting takes place annually and the plants annually die until the wood is cut down, and then the oaks, hickories, etc., have just the start they want and grow to trees; the shade of a pine wood being less favorable to young pines than to young oaks. When hard wood is cut off, the pines often have a similar start, the squirrels having carried off most of the nuts and acorns to the pine woods. If the pine wood that is cut down be surrounded by white oaks, white oaks will succeed; if by shrub oaks, you may expect a thicket of them. But to show how the squirrels work: "On the 24th of September, 1857, as I was paddling down the Asabet in this town, I saw a red squirrel run along the bank under the herbage with something large in its mouth. It stopped near the foot of a hemlock, within a couple of rods of me, and hastily pawing a hole with its fore feet, dropped its booty into it, covered it up and retreated part way up the trunk of the tree. As I approached the shore to examine the deposit, the squirrel, descending part way, betrayed no little anxiety about its treasure, and made two or three motions to recover it before it finally retreated. Digging there, I found two green pignuts joined together, with the thick husks on, buried about an inch and a half under the reddish soil of decayed hemlock leaves, just the right depth to plant it."

"If the squirrel was killed, or neglected its deposit, a hickory would spring up. The nearest hickory tree was twenty rods distant." In wood almost exclusively of pines, except for some few oaks on the north-east, otherwise thirty rods distant from all other woods, little oaks from three to twelve inches high have been discovered, alternating with ferns and small bushes, but growing not further than five feet from one another, and with a degree of regularity; and green acorns had been dropped at the base of the pines, while red squirrels were numerous in the grove. A red maple, twenty-five feet long, and recently prostrated by the wind, was near. Oaks, probably, do better in the shade of pines, for the first few years of their growth, than if altogether unprotected; and this has been deduced from the very careful and thorough experiments of English planters. Loudon recommends the practice adopted by the government officers who have charge of the English national forests, of planting Scotch pines with oaks, using the pines to nurse and shelter the oaks for a few years, and then gradually cutting them away. (Mr. Thoreau then gave a number of instances in which birds and squirrels break off and transport pignuts, chesnuts, chesnut burs, etc.; some from his own observation, and others which had been told to him by trustworthy persons.) The woodmouse, too, is employed in this business of planting. In the winter, you may see the snow full of holes, where the squirrels have pawed through it to the deposit or to reach their treasures. Squirrel tracks often lead through the snow from the evergreen woods, where these animals winter, to the nearest nut or oak tree, if it retain any fruit. Many pine cones are cut off by the squirrels, some long before they are ripe, and "I have counted in one heap, within a diameter of four feet, the cores of two hundred and thirty-nine pitch pine cones which had been stripped by the red squirrels the previous winter."

Nuts planted by squirrels are placed in the most favorable circumstances for germinating. So when nuts fall from chestnut trees, the leaves fall afterward, and by the end of December the nuts are covered with moist leaves, which keep them fresh and prevent their withering. Planters have found that the best way to plant nuts is to beat them into the earth with a spade, and then cover them with leaves or straw. But the squirrels are not alone in their planting business. Long since, it was observed that the jays, in foraging to supply their winter stores, drop abundance of seed and acorns, as they fly from tree to tree. The seeds of trees need not, then, be supposed to lie dormant in the ground for centuries, as they have been supposed to do, in order to account for the rotation of trees. In fact it would be difficult to believe this theory, for the very same authorities who propose it agree in stating the fact that acorns and other seeds of trees lose their virtue very soon. Beech mast retains its vital properties for one year only; few acorns will sprout after being kept a year—so say the botanists, and observation confirms the statement. Even the stories of wheat raised from seed supposed to have lain thousands of years in Egyptian tombs, have not sufficient evidence to support them. Some seeds, especially small ones, certainly retain their vitality for a long time (Mr. Thoreau here gave some instances of this which had been observed by himself), but it is not necessary to assume this in the case of forest trees, in order to account for the phenomena we are considering.—*The Century.*

"AN AWFUL GOOD SERMON."

That was the remark of Mrs. Nipperkins, as she came out of church. Mrs. Nipperkins is very devout, but she is in no peril of insanity from excess or over action of brain. She is easily suited as to her intellectual and spiritual fodder, not requiring much in quantity, and being perfectly indifferent as to quality. Mrs. Nipperkins's remark about the sermon was just, though she did not know it. The sermon was "awful good." It was good in that it was not positively wicked; it was not profane, at least in intent and with malice aforethought, although there were some passages in which the Infinite and his character and purposes were handled with a rough familiarity and grossness nearly as shocking to sensitive Christians as an oath in a less sacred place. But the sermon as a whole was unquestionably good, for the preacher several times declared, patronizingly, that he had taken the Lord's side as against the devil, and that in spite of all this world's seductions he had decided to deny himself some creature comforts here for the sake of escaping infinite calamities hereafter. It was good, for the preacher distinctly declared that goodness is a very excellent thing, and though it cannot help any man towards salvation, which is a matter quite aside and disconnected from personal character and actual life, yet it is creditable to religion that its professors should do good things—at least respectable things—and therefore he felt that he might innocently approve and commend the various human virtues, with the distinct understanding always that they have no value in and of themselves. Yes, the sermon was good, for it embraced many excellent words and phrases, some from Scripture and others from standard works of theology, and the soundest scheme of doctrine was closely interwoven into all its parts, so that no hearer could be at a loss exactly where to locate the preacher among the various theological schools.

* * The sermon was awful, too, in its entire separation from all human feelings and sympathies. It was as unreal and artificial as a wax baby. It had no more connection with human life as it is, than a problem in conic sections. The preacher evidently saw this, and so he sent almost the whole race to their terrible doom with as much coolness and *sang froid* as if they were only so many pitch pine knots to keep up the everlasting burning. Then the contempt for men, the easy familiarity with the Supreme Being, and the utter want of any, the least, appearance of a tender and sympathizing human heart, in the whole performance, combined to make the expression "awful" the most fitting description of the sermon. Heaven save us from "awful good sermons." They petrify men into stones, and freeze them into icebergs. They reverse the common phrase, and

"Steal the livery of the court of hell
To fight the devil in."

—*Springfield Republican.*

TO GEORGE B. CHEEVER.

Take up the mantle which the prophets wore;
Warn with their warnings; show the Christ once more
Bound, scourged, and crucified in his blameless poor;
And shake above our land
The unquenched bolts that blazed in Hosea's hand!

1st Ninth Mo., 1860. JOHN G. WHITTIER.

DISCOVERY OF A MANUSCRIPT OF THE TIME OF DAVID.

In the year 1858 a Theban mountaineer discovered in a hill, called by the Arabs Shin-abd-el-Gourna, a tomb cut out of the rock, in which he found a mummy-case with a gold spread-eagle and a golden asp; also a tablet of green stone, a box with four canopi of Oriental alabaster, and, on the side of a magnificent mummy with a gilded mask and a large gilded scarabæus of porcelain on its breast, a most remarkable papyrus scroll, five feet long and ten inches wide, written in the finest hieratic and hieroglyphic characters. The four jars were sold to Lord Henry Scott, a young Englishman. The mask was purchased by a captain who purchased and sold antiquities at Thebes, and was transferred by him to the French consular agent at that place, and may be now either in his possession or in the museum at Paris. The papyrus as also the scarabæus, the tablet and the eagle, came into the hands of George A. Stone, Esq., of Roxbury, Massachusetts, then travelling in Egypt. Mr. Stone sent copies and photographs of the papyrus to several Egyptologists in New York, who attempted its translation, but failed, because they were only acquainted with Champollion's system. Finally, Mr. Stone sent a photographic copy to Professor G. Seyffarth, of St. Louis, Mobile, having been informed that this gentleman had published, in the year 1833 and 1835, the key to the Egyptian literature and to the ancient astronomical inscriptions and monuments. This savant, the author of the "Summary of Recent Discoveries," &c., New York, 1859, and a large number of other works, has just published the translations and explanations, as requested of him, in the Translations of the Academy of Science of St. Louis for the year 1859, (pp. 527–567,) with sixteen lithographic plates. The biography of Horsebe (the sword of Horus) is to be found in the first column of the papyrus, and we learn by it that he was the commanding general of Pharaoh Shishak I., who slew the last king of Manetho's XXIst dynasty, and suppressed by his captain the rebels in five different provinces of Egypt. This Shishak I., the head of the XXIId dynasty, lived, according to Manetho and the movements, one hundred and twenty-four years previous to Shishak II., the conquerer of Jerusalem (1 Kings xi. 40—xiv. 25), in the fifth year of Rehoboam (945 B. C.), Horsebe was consequently a contemporary of Saul and David, and the papyrus in question has been written about the year 1050 B. C., or three hundred years before the foundation of Rome, and is at present two thousand nine hundred years old. The residue of this precious manuscript contains a new religious book of the ancient Egyptians, and begins with the following sentences: "The Book of Hymns for singing the glories of Him who made Isis [the earth]; the glories of that invisible Being who made Osiris [the sun] (the originator of the life of his race; the originator of the life of his nation, and the originator of the circle of the solar year with its seasons; the builder of the sacrificial quadrupeds, being convenient for him in his house of light, and ordered by his father, the Lord Governor; the originator of the priests for his race in the firmament, and for Adon, the Lord); who made Meni [the moon] (the originator of the flax-seed, of her own sex, and of spinners and weavers for the races in both the regions of Egypt, and also for the makers of cloths for the people); who made the most holy one, the apotheosed mighty chief of the Crethi [the standing army], the warriors of the mighty Egyptians, those in the city of the Sun [Thebes], the capital of the sovereign of Egypt, of the shepherd of all born in Egypt and its vicinities, namely the mighty Horsebe." After this introduction a grand hymn begins.—*Evening Post.*

THE QUEEN TRAVELLING INCOGNITO.

The Banffshire *Journal* gives the following particulars of Her Majesty's recent *incognito* visit to Grantown: Leaving Balmoral on Tuesday morning, the party drove up the Dee to the foot of the Geldie, where they got ponies, and thence rode through Glenfeshie, guided by Lord Alexander Russell, brother of the Duke of Bedford. The Spey was crossed in an open coble. Two carriages were subsequently used. Granton was reached about a quarter before 9 o'clock, p. m. Mrs. Glass, the landlady of the hotel, had dinner prepared; but not being aware of the distinguished character of her guests, she only offered them such fare as would have been provided to ordinary visitors. Sir George Grey and Lady Churchill dined with the Queen and the Prince Consort. The servants in attendance spoke of the queen as her ladyship; but in answer to inquiries, at one time spoke of Her Majesty and the Prince as Lord Churchill (brother of the Duke of Marlborough) and Lady Churchill; and at another time as Dr. and Mrs. Grey. Although it was evident from these contradictory statements that some disguise was assumed, no attempt was made to ascertain the truth, and the general opinion in the hotel was that Sir George Grey was the gentleman of highest rank in the party, and the greatest deference was accordingly paid to him. The Queen and Prince retired at a little past 11 o'clock. Her Majesty's maid remarked that "Her ladyship was quite pleased with the bedroom," and although Her Majesty may never before have slept in so plain an apartment, it contains everything necessary for comfort. Henceforth it will be known as 'Victoria's chamber," and a silver plate, with

ble inscription, is to be procured and hung up in the bed. The Queen rose on Wednesday morning about 8 o'clock. Her Majesty took oatmeal porridge to breakfast. She neither used milk nor any other condiment with it, remarking that any such thing only spoiled the porridge. Sir George Grey and Lady Churchill likewise took the same fare, and Her Majesty gave oatmeal cakes a preference to any other kind of bread. The carriages were ordered at a quarter before 10 o'clock. By this time rain was beginning to fall—the weather had been fine on the previous day—and the Prince Consort made this the subject of conversation with Mrs. Glass, talking very frankly. Mrs. Glass, in her ordinary way, asked her visitors, as they were leaving, if they had lodged comfortably, and was informed that they were quite delighted with their treatment. With a view to their comfort on the journey, she offered the royal party plaids to keep them warm; but these were respectfully declined with thanks, by the Prince Consort. Mrs. Glass then recommended her august visitors to take a drive past Castle Grant, the residence of the Earl of Seafield, as they would find it worth seeing, and they agreed to adopt this recommendation. The carriage containing the Queen and the Prince Consort was then driven off, and Sir George Grey, in